

4551. Also, resolution adopted by the governing body of the city of Clifton, N. J., calling upon the Government of the United States to take action to ensure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4552. Also, resolution adopted by the governing body of the city of Passaic, N. J., calling upon the Government of the United States to take action to ensure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4553. Also, telegram from the Meat Cutters Union, local 389, American Federation of Labor of Passaic County, opposing the enactment of the national service law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4554. By Mr. CHURCH: Petition of Mrs. W. D. Schermerhorn and 11 other citizens of Evanston and Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4555. Also, petition of Elsie Johnston and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4556. By Mr. EBERHARTER: Petition of J. J. O'Donnell and 2,760 residents of the Thirty-first Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4557. Also, petition of E. F. Kredel and 580 residents of Pittsburgh, Pa., and vicinity, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4558. By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan: Petition of Ervin Stoepsand, of Custer, Mich., and 33 others, opposing subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4559. Also, petition of Adelaide Zoeller, of Muskegon, Mich., and 19 others, favoring House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4560. Also, petition of Rose Brown, of Manton, Mich., and 48 others, favoring House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4561. Also, petition of George M. Tyndall, of Branch, Mich., and 17 others opposing subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4562. Also, petition of John Bielcik, of Thompsonville, Mich., and 45 others, opposing subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4563. Also, petition of Fred Kundrata, of Muskegon, Mich., and 112 others, favoring the soldiers' vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4564. Also, petition of Fred Kundrata, of Muskegon, Mich., and 20 others, favoring subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4565. Also, petition of Rev. Otto W. Lamb, of Muskegon, Mich., and 24 others, favoring passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4566. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles H. Redman, of Muskegon Heights, Mich., and 39 others, favoring House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4567. Also, petition of Vinnie Russell, of Muskegon, Mich., and 62 others, favoring the soldiers vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4568. Also, petition of Mildred Poe, of Lake City, Mich., and 37 others, favoring House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4569. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by members of the Bronx County New York State American Youth for Democracy, urging the passage of legislation which will guarantee the right of servicemen to vote in the 1944 elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4570. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. F. M. Sorenson, president of the Butler County, Iowa, Women's Christian Temperance Union, and signed by many residents of that county, urging passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States during wartime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4571. By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia: Eleven petitions of more than 225 citizens of Tidewater, Va., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4572. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication signed by J. P. Willis, superintendent, and 13 teachers of the Golconda public schools, Golconda, Ill., favoring House bill 2849; to the Committee on Education.

4573. Also, communications signed by Agnes V. Sidenes, of New Liberty, and Claude Faulkner, of Eddyville, Ill., school teachers of Pope County, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 2849; to the Committee on Education.

4574. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of 246 citizens of Berks County, Pa., protesting the passage of House bill 2082, or any similar legislation, designed to prohibit the sale, manufacture, distribution, importation, etc., of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4575. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of W. K. Rudolph, Jack L. Blanchard, Mrs. Romney Rudolph, Mrs. Irvin Cornwell, Mrs. Jack L. Blanchard, Mrs. Benton Staley, Earl Wilder, and B. A. Staley, all of Waxahachie, Tex., opposing the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4576. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of E. Copeland and 39 other residents of Steubenville, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4577. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, San Francisco, Calif., opposing the National Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4578. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Etienne P. Lesjardin, of Lewiston, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4579. Also, petition of Anthon A. Carmier, of Lewiston, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4580. Also, petition of the Super-Economy Market, Waterville, Maine, and citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4581. Also, petition of Gedeon Pelletier, of Lewiston, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4582. Also, petition of Vigile Houle, of Lewiston, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, January 24, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's unfailing friend and his ever-present help, we pray that Thou wilt so expand our minds and hearts that they may be large enough to comprehend the revelations of Thy truth, Thy will, and Thy love.

We humbly confess that we are continually invalidating these revelations by taking counsel with our fears and allowing our spiritual visions to become eclipsed by doubt and despair.

Grant that we may realize that human ingenuity and human resources are merely contingencies and that we must put our trust in the eternal certainties of God.

We pray that faith in the Lord God of hosts may rise up within us and take full possession and guardianship of our bewildered lives.

Lord we believe, help Thou our unbelief. In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 27, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	O'Daniel
Andrews	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Robertson
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Bione	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brewster	Hayden	Smith
Bridges	Hill	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Langer	Truman
Butler	Lodge	Tunnell
Byrd	McClellan	Tydings
Capper	McFarland	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wagner
Clark Idaho	Maloney	Wallgren
Clark Mo.	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wilson
Downey	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are members of the committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana, and therefore are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are in Indiana as members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Van Nuys.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to law, the Chair appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] a visitor to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been informed by the President pro tempore of the Senate that, under authority of Public Law No. 196, approved December 3, 1943, he has appointed as members on the part of the Senate of the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee the following Senators:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LANDS RESERVED WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS FOR POWER SITES, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no lands were reserved during the calendar year 1943 within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION UNDER PUBLIC LAW NO. 498, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth report of that Administration of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1934, as amended, Public Law No. 498, Seventy-seventh Congress (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the board of directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SAFETY OF LIFE AND PROPERTY: REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Commission has no recommendation to make at this time for new safety legislation of the type referred to under section 4 (k) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ESTIMATES OF PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF TWO OFFICES

Letters, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, by the Department of Commerce (War Training Service, Civil Aeronautics Administration), and the Federal Communications Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate petitions, etc., which were referred as indicated:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from members of Plumbers and Steamfitters Local Union No. 447, of Sacramento, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation granting \$500 mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing a wartime method of voting by members of the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mrs. Nannie Nash, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a wartime method of voting by members of the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 1673) to provide for a national cemetery in Jefferson County, Ala., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

READJUSTMENT IN CIVILIAN LIFE OF RETURNING WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us to the bill (S. 1617) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, known as the Legion omnibus bill.

We are all proud of the record of our boys in the service, and recognize that they have been called upon to make great sacrifices. There will be unrest among them when they return from the fox

holes, swamps, and deserts. Many will have given the best years of their lives. They have left good homes to fight beasts on the other side under the most trying conditions; their mental and physical strength is being taxed to the uttermost. We cannot expect them to return and be able to take up just where they left off—whether it was at school or at work. They will need assistance which will necessarily have to vary in accordance with their different needs. Some of them will need to return to high school or college; others will want to attend occupational schools; many who have already finished school and are married will need homes; some have left the farm and upon their return will need money with which to purchase equipment. Many had to sell their farm equipment at a great sacrifice when they left to enter the service, and others have had to sell small businesses at sacrifices and will want to start enterprises for themselves upon their return.

Recognizing this problem, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and I, after giving this subject careful study, introduced S. 1495. We feel this bill meets the problem by providing adjusted pay upon discharge in the form of a 10-year bond which may not be cashed for 3 years, except for educational purposes, down-payment on a home, purchase of a farm or farm implements, or for payment on a small business.

This was the first and I believe the most comprehensive bill covering all of these subjects introduced in the Senate. Since that time several bills have been introduced covering various phases of the subject—including the Legion omnibus bill, S. 1617. We feel that the adjusted pay is the best and most practical manner of meeting the problem, particularly for the reason that almost everyone recognizes that there will be adjusted pay. With this thought in mind, we thought we should have legislation giving them the benefit of this adjusted pay at the time they would need it the most for the purposes which I have just outlined. However, we recognize that there are those who feel that the adjusted pay question should wait until the men return from the service. I do not share this view, and feel there would be no better morale builder than the passage of S. 1495; on the other hand, the most important phases of S. 1495 are the educational benefits, the assistance in the purchase of a home, assistance in the purchasing of a farm or farm equipment, also, in the purchase of small businesses. Therefore, we have, in conjunction with the legislative council of the American Legion, taken these most important provisions of S. 1495 and drafted this amendment to S. 1617. The amendment has the backing of the American Legion and will reach the objectives for which we are working. It will give every man in the service an equal opportunity to secure their benefits.

In the event that Senate bill 1617 is favorably reported by the Senate, it is our hope and the hope of the American Legion that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be appropriately referred, printed, and printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) to the bill (S. 1617) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, viz: On page 9, beginning with line 22, strike out down to and including line 20 on page 16, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"PART VIII

"1. Subject to the provisions and limitations of this part, any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after August 27, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, who shall not have been dishonorably separated therefrom, and who shall have been separated therefrom after service of 90 days or more, or shall have been separated therefrom after less than 90 days of service for disability incurred in line of duty, shall, upon application to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, be entitled to pursue a course of education or training under this part. Such course of education or training may be any full-time course of education or training (including refresher courses) in any accredited educational or training institution selected by the veteran, if such institution finds the veteran qualified for and accepts him for such course of education or training. No course of education or training under this part in excess of a period of 4 years shall be approved, nor shall any training or education under this part be afforded beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

"2. While pursuing a course of education or training under this part, the veteran shall be entitled to a training allowance, to be paid by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, which shall be at the rate of \$50 a month, except that if the veteran is a man and is married, or is a woman and is married to a husband who is shown to the satisfaction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be dependent upon her for support, such allowance shall be at the rate of \$75 a month.

"3. When any veteran pursues a course of education or training at any institution under this part, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay to such institution with respect to such veteran the customary tuition, laboratory, library, and other fees ordinarily paid by or for students at such institution; but such payments shall not include charges for board, lodging, or other living expenses. The Administrator shall not pay any part of such fees which is in excess of a rate equivalent to \$300 for an ordinary school year and shall not pay such fees for a period longer than the equivalent of 4 ordinary school years.

"4. When the course of education or training under this part consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement under oath showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to the veteran during the month, directly or indirectly; and based upon such sworn statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce or discontinue the training allowance.

"5. Any person who, while pursuing a course of education or training under this part, is receiving a pension or compensation under other laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, shall be paid only so much of the training allowance provided under this part for any month as will, when added to the pension or compensation, aggregate the training allowance which would

otherwise be payable for such month under this part. No person who receives vocational rehabilitation under part VII of this regulation shall be entitled to receive education or training under this part.

"6. Any public or private elementary, secondary or other school furnishing education for adults, any business school, college, vocational school, or other educational institution, and any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, shall be deemed to be an accredited educational or training institution for the purposes of this part, if it is found by a board appointed under this paragraph to be qualified and suitable for furnishing education or training under this part, and if it complies with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the proper administration of this part. Such Administrator shall appoint in each State a board of five members, not less than three of whom shall be members of the faculties of educational institutions having educational or scientific courses in advance of the subjects taught in standard high school courses. Each such board shall determine whether or not any institution or establishment in its State in which a veteran desires to pursue a course of education or training under this part is qualified and suitable for providing such education or training; and shall perform such other duties and functions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe. The members of such board shall not receive any compensation for their services on the board, but shall be reimbursed for all necessary travel expenses and shall receive a per diem allowance of \$15 in lieu of subsistence while away from their respective places of residence on business of the board.

"7. In carrying out his powers and duties under this part, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs—

"(a) May prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or appropriate.

"(b) May employ such additional personnel and experts as are deemed necessary, and may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contributions.

"(c) Shall consult with and may utilize the services and facilities of the respective State departments of education of the several States.

"(d) May enter into such agreements or arrangements with public or private institutions or agencies as he finds to be suitable and necessary to accomplish the purposes of this part.

"(e) May accept uncompensated services upon such terms and conditions as he deems proper.

"8. Such rules and regulations of the Administrator may include such rules and regulations as he deems necessary in order to promote good conduct and cooperation upon the part of persons who are pursuing courses of education or training under this part. Penalties for the breach of such rules or regulations may with the approval of the Administrator extend to a forfeiture or discontinuance of any part of the benefits provided by this part."

SEC. 502. Paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended by Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, March 24, 1943, is hereby amended by deleting the date "December 6, 1941," in the first sentence thereof, and substituting the date "August 27, 1940."

TITLE IV. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOANS

SEC. 600. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States for more than 90 days at any time after August 27, 1940, and prior

to the termination of the present war, who is not dishonorably separated therefrom, upon separation from active service shall be deemed to be a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title. Any such veteran may apply to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for a loan for any of the purposes specified in sections 601, 602, and 603. If the Administrator finds that the veteran is eligible for the benefits of this title and is in need of such loan, the Administrator shall submit the veteran's application for approval of the loan as provided in sections 601, 602, and 603. When any such loan has been approved as provided in such sections, the loan shall be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(b) The aggregate of all loans made to any one veteran under this title shall be for such amount not in excess of a thousand dollars as may be applied for by the veteran. Any such loan shall bear no interest for the first year after the loan is made, and thereafter shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, compounded annually. No guarantor of any such loan shall be required and no security for the loan shall be required except for a lien, which shall be a first lien where no other lien is required in the purchase of such property; otherwise it shall be a second lien.

(c) Any loan made under this title shall be repayable to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and except as otherwise provided in this title, shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed jointly by such Administrator and the head of the department or agency to whom the application is submitted for approval of the loan.

PURCHASE OF HOMES

SEC. 601. (a) Any application made under this section for a loan to be used in purchasing residential property shall be submitted to the Federal Housing Administrator for his approval. Such Administrator shall approve the loan if he finds—

(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for such property to be purchased by the veteran;

(2) that such property has been approved for mortgage insurance under the National Housing Act as amended or meets the location and construction requirements for such approval; and

(3) that the purchase price paid, or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the appraised value thereof as determined by the Federal Housing Administrator.

(b) Any application for a loan under this section for the purpose of paying delinquent indebtedness, taxes, or special assessments, on residential property previously purchased for a home by the veteran shall be submitted to the Federal Housing Administrator who shall approve such loan unless in his opinion such loan is unsound or would not be in the interest of the veteran.

(c) No first mortgage shall be ineligible for insurance under the National Housing Act as amended, by reason of any loan made under this title, or by reason of any secondary lien upon the property involved securing such loan.

PURCHASE OF FARMS AND FARM EQUIPMENT

SEC. 602. (a) Any application made under this title for a loan to be used in purchasing any land, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, or implements, to be used in farming operations conducted by the applicant, shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for his approval of the loan. Such Secretary shall approve the loan if he finds—

(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used in bona fide farming operations conducted by him;

(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

(3) that the character, ability, and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor as determined by the Secretary.

(b) Any person who is found by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to have served in the active military or naval service of the United States for more than 90 days at any time after August 27, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, who shall not have been dishonorably separated therefrom, and who shall have been separated therefrom after service of 90 days or more, or shall have been separated therefrom after less than 90 days of service for disability incurred in line of duty, and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture, by reason of his character, ability, and experience to be likely successfully to carry out undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

PURCHASE OF BUSINESS PROPERTY

Sec. 603. Any application made under this title for a loan to be used in purchasing any business, land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, or tools, to be used by the applicant in pursuing a gainful occupation (other than farming), shall be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce for his approval of the loan. Such Secretary shall approve the loan if he finds—

(1) that such loan will be used for part payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used by him in the bona fide pursuit of a gainful occupation (other than farming);

(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such occupation;

(3) that the character, ability, and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such occupation; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor as determined by the Secretary.

LEGISLATIVE RULE RELATING TO SUBJECT MATTER OF LEGISLATION AND REVISION OF STATUTES

Mr. ANDREWS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That every bill or joint resolution passed by the Congress shall embrace but one subject and matter properly connected therewith, which subject shall be briefly stated in the title of such bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 2. That no law shall be amended or revised by reference to its title only; but in every case the law, as revised, or section, as amended, shall be reenacted and published at length.

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR SMITH, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BY JACOB SIMPSON PAYTON

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, under the heading "A Senator remembers," by Jacob

Simpson Payton, published in the Christian Advocate of January 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR BUTLER CITES FIGURES—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBUS EVENING DISPATCH

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Here's the Proof—Senator BUTLER Cites Figures," published in the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch of January 24, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE LAW

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Capt. Herman Hirsh, of the Marine Corps, addressed to the Senators from Pennsylvania, regarding a national service law, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES FOR SOLDIERS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several letters relating to votes for servicemen, which appear in the Appendix.]

JAPANESE MISTREATMENT OF AMERICAN PRISONERS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the headlines in the morning newspapers. We are saddened by those headlines, which read:

Five thousand two hundred Yank war prisoners killed by Jap torture in Philippines; cruel "march of death" described; other thousands of victims were Filipinos; captives were starved, beaten, bayoneted, shot, and even beheaded, Army and Navy report.

Mr. President, this is just another example of the cruelty and the brutality of the Japanese. It is evidence that the leaders of that race are not fit to govern any people. May God be with the relatives of those brave boys who have made the supreme sacrifice.

The Japs will pay, and pay dearly. Our answer will be in blood, and in the ashes of their cities. Those responsible for this brutality must pay, but God forbid that we would ever resort to such torture, even toward beasts such as these. Let them be lined up and shot, that their feet may scorch in hell, where they belong.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have asked the Senator to yield because he has discussed a matter which is of vital concern to me. I propose to discuss it further today. I have agreed with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], however, not to interrupt consideration of the appropriation bill. As soon as consideration of the bill is concluded, which I hope may be quickly, I wish to make some comments about the atrocities revealed in the morning newspapers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much. The joint resolution must be passed by Monday in order that the very necessary work covered by it may be continued.

NATIONAL SERVICE LEGISLATION—LETTER FROM SGT. JOHN O. RANEY

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have not risen to say anything concern-

ing the matter which was called to the attention of the Senate by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], but I wish to compliment him upon the statement he has made. The only thing I wish to say is that these facts were known sometime ago, and it seems to me the War Department and the Navy Department should have made the report at an earlier time, so that the American people could have known what the facts were.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter written to me by an American boy, a sergeant in the American Army who is with our flying forces in England. He writes me with reference to the legislation which has been proposed by the President and advocated by the Secretary of War, known as the national-service legislation. He writes me as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Although you will no doubt be much too busy to read this, will write it anyway just in case. In our Army paper, the Stars and Stripes, we have been following the debate pro and con on the national-service law and as crew members of the flying forts of the Eighth Air Force we feel we have a right to a few words. We would like to state and we may be quoted—

Mr. President, I read the letter because of that statement; otherwise I would not have quoted it—

That we are firmly against the bill. We do not like the idea of anyone taking our wives, mothers, fathers, sisters, or brothers from the very homes we are fighting for and place them on a farm, ranch, or any other damn place they see fit. We were led to understand that the law in question once caused a civil war and was settled for all time. Frankly, sir, we are sick and tired of hearing a few politicians try to bring slavery back to the United States. If anyone would care to see how miserably that same law has failed in England, tell them to come over. It has ruined thousands of women and broken thousands of homes. We did not want to come over here and do not wish to be here now, but since we must, we will and are doing our best. However, if this bill is passed, I for one am through flying and fighting, for when my Government invades my home, the only thing we have left, there is nothing left to fight for.

Respectfully yours,

Staff Sgt. JOHN O. RANEY,
Three Hundred and Eighty-eighth
Bomb Group, Five Hundred and
Sixty-third Squadron, A. P. O.
634, care of Postmaster, New
York City.

Mr. President, this letter was passed by the British censor, and was passed by the American censor.

When the statement is made by the Secretary of War and by others that unless the proposed legislation is passed the morale of the soldiers will be broken down, it seems to me a letter such as this furnishes ample proof that quite the contrary is true. It is certainly true here in the United States, and it is true apparently among the soldiers fighting overseas.

CANADIAN FARM EQUIPMENT AND MACHINERY

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to a letter which I received from the vice president of an implement com-

pany in Montana. The letter is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am attaching hereto a copy of a letter that this firm received today from the Canadian Trade Commissioner, Chicago, Ill. May I direct your attention to the first part of the first sentence of this letter in which it is very specifically and definitely intimated that Canada might be in a position to furnish certain farm implements and machinery for export to the United States in the near future?

It seems mighty queer to me and to a lot of the rest of us Americans that the War Production Board and the War Food Administration are allocating farm equipment for export to Canada and to other British possessions and depriving the American farmer and rancher of equipment that he so badly needs; while at the same time the Canadian manufacturers apparently have a surplus of farm equipment and machinery that they in turn can export to the United States.

I don't care necessarily to have the name of this firm or my own name involved in this, if it can be handled without; but on the other hand, if it is necessary this letter can be used.

It is signed by the vice president of the company.

The letter which the writer received from the Canadian Government Trade Commissioner, Tribune Tower, 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, under date of January 14, 1944, is as follows:

DEAR SIRS: In view of the shortage of farm implements and machinery at this time and the possibility of supplies from Canada in the near future, would you inform me if there would be a market in your territory for importations of Canadian farm implements and machinery. If so, would you advise me of the estimated tonnage or amount that would be marketable.

I would appreciate an early reply at your convenience and thanking you in advance, I am,

Yours faithfully,

H. A. SPENCER,

Acting Canadian Trade Commissioner.

Mr. President, the farmers of the United States have been pleading for farm implements. They have been told not only that they could not obtain farm implements, but as a matter of fact that they should turn in such farm implements as they had on hand which they were not using or which were out of repair, because the Government needed steel and other metals. As the writer of the letter states, we have been exporting farm implements to Canada, and at the same time Canadians are writing asking implement dealers in the United States whether they can sell Canadian farm implements which are manufactured in Canada.

I have written letters to the War Production Board and to the War Food Administration asking them upon what ground they can hold back American farm implements from the farmers of this country and at the same time Canadians can be offering to sell farm implements to the people of the United States.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR FOR 1944

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) making

an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 4, after the word "appropriated", to insert "the following sums, namely" and in line 5, after the word "namely", in the amendment just above stated, to strike out:

The sum of \$27,000,000, which sum, together with the amount appropriated in the act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), shall be merged into one fund, to remain available until December 31, 1944, and to be expended by the War Food Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pursuant to Executive Order No. 9334, dated April 19, 1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, as follows.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

For assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, \$35,000,000, which sum, together with the amount appropriated in the act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), shall be merged into one fund, to remain available until December 31, 1944, and to be expended by the War Food Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pursuant to Executive Order No. 9334, dated April 19, 1943, as follows:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Payments to States," on page 2, line 22, after the word "need", to strike out "not more than \$17,500,000" and insert "not less than \$14,000,000 and not more than \$18,500,000"; on page 3, line 8, after the word "recruiting", to strike out "(including recruitment within the State of recruitment for employment elsewhere)"; in line 11, after the word "transportation", to strike out "including transportation from State to State and within the State of recruitment for employment elsewhere"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$100,000"; in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$20,000"; in line 24, after the word "advances", to strike out the comma and "the repayments from employers for such advances to be credited to the respective funds apportioned to the States"; and on page 4, line 7, after the word "things", to insert "the furnishing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Expenditure of other funds," on page 4, line 23, after the words "shall be", to strike out "allotted" and insert "available for expenditure"; in line 24, after the word "Administrator", to strike out "to the Office of Extension, War Food

Administration, for expenditure, of which not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses in the District of Columbia"; on page 5, line 5, before the word "workers", to strike out "foreign."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, in line 9, after the word "families", to strike out the comma and the words "while en route, including the furnishing of health and medical services to agricultural workers and their families housed in any labor supply center operated as a part of this program."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to be heard briefly in opposition to the committee amendment. As I understand the amendment, its net effect, if agreed to, would be to confine medical services solely to migratory workers who are brought in from some other country and transported or given placement under the program envisioned by the joint resolution. It seems to me it is not a proper policy to grant help and medical care to migrant workers or seasonal workers who are brought from one of our neighboring countries, and to deny it to an American citizen who may have been transported just as far or farther from his home, and who is working side by side with the alien who has been brought in. I am not attempting to raise any invidious issue as between American citizens and aliens; but what I have stated is the net effect of the amendment as I understand it. I am anxious to have the amendment rejected on its own merits. If it be rejected, I wish to offer an amendment on behalf of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], at the request of his State medical association.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wonder if the Senator's construction can be correct in view of the fact that the amendment on page 5, line 5, striking out the word "foreign," has been agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, that is what I was about to call to the attention of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. It appears to me that by striking out the word "foreign," the matter referred to has been taken care of.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it is my understanding, and I should like to have the acting chairman of the committee correct me if I am mistaken, that on representations from the State Department that the Mexican Government was concerned, to say the least, lest workers from Mexico coming into this country might not have medical and health care, the committee had proposed to amend the joint resolution so that its effect would be to make the medical and health care available to seasonal workers coming into this country from outside the United States, but not available to those transported in the United States who are American citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will state how the question arose. If the Senator will read lines 4, 5, and 6 of the joint resolution as it was passed by the

House, he will observe they read as follows:

The recruiting and transportation of foreign workers and their families and necessary personal property, within the United States and elsewhere.

Many of them bring their families. Certainly the United States Government should not be required to furnish medical attention for their families.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to this matter, and to ask him to state how the provision in the joint resolution would actually operate inasmuch as he has been closely connected with it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me to do so, I should like to say that as the measure was written, the House contemplated that the Federal authorities would handle only foreign workers, leaving everything else to be handled by the extension services of the States. When the Senate just now struck out the word "foreign," it made the bill read so as to cover all workers.

If the Senator will read a little further, he will find that beginning in line 7, provision is made to furnish to workers and their families health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter.

What we were getting away from was the limitation placed by the House as to foreign workers while en route. The House repeated the language. In other words, the House contemplated that the foreign worker would be recruited, and that while he was en route to the State he could receive this service, and that thereafter it would be rendered by the State authority.

We have struck out the word "foreign," and that makes the provision apply to all workers. There is ample authority in the measure to provide health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, and so forth, for such workers and their families—that is to say, all workers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then let me ask, in connection with the amendment which has been brought to my attention by the secretary of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], whether it is the Senator's interpretation that such services and allowances will be available only to those who have been transported.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct, because the joint resolution says:

The recruiting and transportation of workers.

If the worker was recruited and transported, he could get medical service in just the way provided for by the measure as reported from the committee.

What the senior Senator from California desired to do was to provide that a worker who moved from one State to another on his own power, a worker who was not recruited and was not transported, might also receive medical care and attention. I do not see why the Senator cannot offer that amendment without insisting on having the Senate reject the committee's amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I think the Senator has straightened me out on this

matter, and that my information was correct insofar as the effect of the measure as passed by the House was concerned, but was not correct insofar as the changes proposed by the Senate committee are concerned.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to be frank, and to say that I have been tied up with the tax bill conference, and have not had a thorough opportunity to study this matter.

So I think I can wait until the committee amendment with respect to the matter has been disposed of, and then offer the amendment to the House text.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think it would be in order now to offer the amendment the Senator has in mind and we can dispose of it immediately.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then, Mr. President, I offer the amendment, to be inserted at the proper place, and send it to the desk.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator has withdrawn his amendment to restore that language?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I withdraw the amendment to reject the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 9, after the word "families", it is proposed to strike out the semicolon and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That funds available to the Administrator may be used for providing health and medical services to other migratory workers and their families who have entered the area without recruitment or assistance of any government agency and have engaged in agricultural work and to whom adequate health and medical services are not otherwise available in the area where they are working."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment just agreed to, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] by the council of the California Medical Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, October 18, 1943.
The Honorable HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
United States Senator From California,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: This letter is written on behalf of the agricultural workers of California who have been served by the Agri-

cultural Workers' Health and Medical Association in the past. Our attention has been directed to the present situation by the medical members of their board of directors.

Your attention is called to that section of Public Law 45 regarding the migratory agricultural workers and their families who would be eligible for health and medical service.

The present wording of the act is so restrictive that it excludes from medical care all agricultural workers who do not receive their employment as a result of some activity of some of the Government agencies financed by Public Law 45. This means that our own American agricultural workers who have sufficient initiative and ingenuity to develop employment resources of their own are denied medical assistance.

In order to broaden the scope of professional services to be rendered, a proposed amendment to Public Law 45, section 3 (a) (2), has been suggested. The proposed amendment would be as follows * * *:

The California Medical Association, an organization of some 7,000 licensed physicians and surgeons, through the council, its constituted authority, requests your support of the proposed amendment.

May we express the hope that you will write us in regard thereto? Kindly address your communication to Karl L. Schaupp, M. D., president, California Medical Association, 450 Sutter Street, room 2004, San Francisco 8, Calif.

With thanks for your help in this.

Cordially yours,

THE COUNCIL OF THE CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
KARL L. SCHAUPP, M. D.,

President.

PHILIP K. GILMAN, M. D.,

Chairman.

By GEORGE H. KRESS, M. D.,

Secretary.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to request information from the Senator from Tennessee relative to the \$8,000,000 item mentioned in the report. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain where it is to be allowed and how it is to be spent?

I read from the report:

War Food Administration: Farm labor program, \$8,000,000.

I should like to know about about.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine page 1 of the joint resolution, he will find that the amount recommended by the House was \$27,000,000. The Budget estimate was \$35,000,000. The difference is \$8,000,000, and the committee has recommended the Budget estimate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 5, in line 15, after the word "advances", to strike out the comma and the words "the repayments from employers for such advances to be credited to the funds available to the Administrator; (4) payments in lieu of taxes on labor supply centers in accordance with the procedure set forth in the act of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 432); (5) determination and payment of claims (not exceeding \$50 in any one case) of workers recruited in foreign countries (a) who, in preparation for transporta-

tion to or from the United States and subsequent failure of such transportation, have suffered losses; or (b) who have been transported to the United States and during said transportation, including embarkation and debarkation, have suffered the loss of or damage to personal effects" and insert "(4) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services"; and on page 6, line 4, after the word "and", to strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether the amendment as now drawn, if agreed to, would prohibit the construction of any centers?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It does not contemplate new construction.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Was there any testimony before the committee that there was any need for such construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was the suggestion on the part of Colonel Bruton that he should be permitted to engage in some construction. He said that what bothered him particularly was that there had been a ruling, by the Comptroller General that to move a Civilian Conservation Corps camp from one place to another was new construction.

The committee had so much difficulty with the matter of labor camps, which was one of the main troubles we were trying to avoid, that the committee decided to restore the words in the original law, as it appears this year, and not provide for having anything new started.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would the Senator object to having the word "relocation" inserted, so as to take care of situations in which is desired to move an old Conservation Corps camp to another place, so that it might be available?

Mr. HAYDEN. We might ask the acting chairman of the committee about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. We might take it to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee did not want to allow a great number of new camps to be built.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would the Senator be willing to take such an amendment to conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. Would that imply that new camps could be built?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; as I understand, if the word "relocation," were inserted after the comma in line 3, after the word "alteration," that would confine it; but if that is not so, it could be corrected in conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it could be confined to the relocation of existing camps, that would be all right; but the committee was opposed to the building of new camps.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It has been brought to my attention that under existing decisions they are not even using old Conservation Corps camps, which may go to rack and ruin because they are not used any more, and the facilities are not moved to places where they can be used. If the Senator would be willing to take the amendment to conference, it

would throw the matter open to further consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. We will take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 3, in the committee amendment, after the word "alteration", it is proposed to insert "relocation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the committee amendment on page 6, line 3.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 5, to strike out:

(b) The Administrator may allocate to any State, in the manner provided in section 2, from the amount made available by this section, such funds for labor supply centers and other necessary services and facilities and for the feeding of workers in such centers, as in his judgment may be more advantageously applied by such State for the Federal Government than by direct expenditure by the War Food Administration. He is also authorized, in connection with the purposes of this subsection, to loan to any State any labor supply center and the facilities and equipment thereof, owned by the United States, under such terms and conditions as he may specify.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 18, before the word "Not", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; in the same line, after the word "than", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "2 percent"; and in line 21, after the word "available", to strike out "for obligation during the calendar year 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 9, before the word "For", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; in the same line, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title"; and in line 17, after the word "this", to strike out "joint resolution" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Limitations," on page 8, line 5, after the word "funds", to strike out "herein", and in line 6, before the words "shall be", to insert "in this title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 14, after the word "funds", to strike out "herein", and in the same line, after the word "appropriated", to insert "in this title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 5, to insert:

(c) No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional offices.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting chairman or the chairman of the subcommittee what

the testimony was with regard to regional offices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the testimony was that, without any authority stated in the present law, the practice of setting up regional offices was followed, and that seven such offices were established. The regional offices were established in various parts of the country. For example, in California a regional office was established in San Francisco, 500 miles away from Los Angeles. At one time 37,500 of the foreign laborers were engaged at work in the Los Angeles district. The regional office was of no particular value. It is very expensive to have seven regional offices maintained all the time. Their employees work by the year, and are paid by the year. There is an average of more than 100 employees at each office, employed all the time. The purpose of the joint resolution is largely to furnish seasonal workers in gathering crops, as the Senator knows. The manager, Colonel Bruton, who is apparently a very level-headed man, stated that some of the regional offices should be abolished. He said he thought two of them, beyond any doubt, should be abolished.

Upon reflection, the committee concluded that all of them should be abolished, and that arrangements should be made by which representatives could be employed in the larger districts where it was necessary to have the work done. For example, in the case of the 37,500 foreign workers an additional office must be maintained at Los Angeles anyway. It is now maintained there, and it ought to be there, because of the fact that of a total number of about 70,000 workers, 57,000 were employed in that one district alone.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It seems to me that under the terms of the committee amendment no regional offices could be maintained.

Mr. McKELLAR. The term "regional office" has a technical meaning. As the Senator knows, the practice of establishing regional offices has grown up. Every governmental agency whose activities cover the entire country or a large part of it immediately establishes regional offices. No soldiers were used in the State of Georgia, and yet a regional office was established at Atlanta. A very large number of foreign workers were assigned to Florida, but there was no office in Florida. It was necessary to go several hundred miles to a regional office, and to Washington, if there was any difference to be settled.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, the joint resolution applies not only to soldiers, but to all workers, either foreign or domestic, who are transported—

Mr. McKELLAR. From one State to another.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. All workers who are transported to areas where there is a shortage of labor. As I understand, from the investigations of a committee on this subject, the charts of migration, even

before we began any recruiting and transportation, show that the migratory worker starts in the South early in the winter and moves north on both coasts, and even in the central States. Such workers move north as the seasons change. It seems to me that it would be very difficult to administer this program without some administrative system. The program is almost a year-around affair, because of the changes in season, and because the United States is a slice of a continent, and has such wide variations in climate. In order to coordinate this movement and give service to farmers in various localities at the time when it is needed, it seems to me it would be necessary to have some administrative organization.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me see if we can arrive at an understanding of this matter by way of definition.

Ordinarily a regional office is an office in which policies for a certain region are determined. Colonel Bruton testified before our committee that all policies are fixed in Washington. For example, in the migratory movement of laborers up the Atlantic coast, when their work in Maryland is completed and they are needed in New Jersey, the New Jersey authorities say how many they want, and the Maryland authorities say how many they can release. That is all handled in Washington. A similar situation prevails in connection with the movement from California to Oregon. The determination as to what numbers are needed, and where they shall be moved, is made in Washington. Therefore, it is not necessary to establish permanent offices in Atlanta, Ga., or Philadelphia, Pa., to handle questions of policy.

What the Senator has in mind, to which the committee had no objection, is this: There must be, of course, an operational field unit. If workers are being moved from Maryland to Pennsylvania and New Jersey, there must be an operational field unit to see that the equipment goes along with them, and to handle the movement in the field. That is a field operation, after the policy has been determined. It is not the desire of our committee to prevent anything like that being done, as the acting chairman has explained; but we do not want to have permanent regional offices established, where policies are determined, when such offices may be needed at one time and not at another.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as I understand the construction of this amendment, it would not prevent the establishment of whatever operational management offices are necessary in order to effectuate the work of this organization.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. With that statement, I am satisfied.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. I am not as familiar with this measure as I should be, because I have been engaged in the work of another committee. As I understand, this law was in effect last year.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me from what countries the foreign workers came?

Mr. HAYDEN. In the greatest numbers they came from Mexico. I cannot tell the Senator offhand exactly how many came from Mexico. It is in the record. The remaining two principal sources are Jamaica and the Bahama Islands. On the Atlantic coast the Jamaicans and Bahamians are used principally. In the Midwest and on the Pacific coast the agricultural laborers came principally from Mexico. There were also some Canadians imported.

Mr. LANGER. Are not the countries from which these laborers have come as interested in winning the war as is the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. What is the logic in our Government, while our soldiers are away fighting for the preservation of those countries importing laborers from those countries to do work in our country?

Mr. McKELLAR. The explanation is that we do not have the necessary number of workers to do the work. If the Senator will read the record he will find that the evidence on that point is overwhelming. During last year the use of foreign labor added enormously to the crop production of the country. The additional production of crops throughout the Nation amounted in value to many million dollars.

I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that in the fruit region adjacent to Los Angeles I understand there are now approximately 7,500 of such workers who are there under the extension of 1 month which we provided for last December in the operation of the law. Their work is very necessary.

A gentleman was in my office yesterday. I do not remember where he came from. Concerning beans he said that, as I recall, 50,000 tons of beans were saved by the help of these workers, and that without them the beans would have been destroyed on the ground or would have rotted in the fields, and would not have been usable as food for mankind.

The farmers who employ the laborers pay them good wages. Their labor is of very great benefit to the war effort in the matter of furnishing food. It is of very great benefit to the farmers of our country wherever the laborers are used. Last year this type of labor was employed in 36 or 37 States. I may say to the Senator that there has been almost universal approval of the work which has been done, and that provision has been made to return the laborers to their respective countries when they are no longer needed. They are not to remain in this country permanently.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has there been any attempt made to bring Puerto Ricans to this country to do some of the work to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I can answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota.

A proposal was made to import Puerto Ricans to do industrial labor, such as the maintenance of railroad tracks, and other work of that kind. Difficulty has been encountered in that respect. I will say frankly that one reason why the proposal is made to import aliens for laboring purposes is that we are certain they will return to their respective homes. That is the first thing which is made certain. The alien is fingerprinted, photographed, and thoroughly identified. He is then given a medical examination, and kept under Federal control all the time he is in the United States. A part of his wages is retained. In the case of Mexicans it is 10 percent, and in the case of those coming from the West Indies \$1 a day is deducted from the wages, sent home, and deposited in a bank to the credit of the individual. We are not in any way interfering with the firmly established national immigration policy. We are strictly enforcing it. One reason why it costs as much as it does is that we keep tab on every individual as long as he is in the United States, and we make sure that he will return to his home when the emergency is over.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am not necessarily opposed to the joint resolution; I am merely trying to obtain some information with regard to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will examine the joint resolution, together with a copy of the hearings, I have not the slightest doubt that he will endorse it, because it is a very valuable measure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to supplement what the able Senator has said. Many of our farmers in Michigan who are producing various fruit crops, and particularly beet crops, would now be out of business without this migratory labor. It is absolutely indispensable.

Mr. McKELLAR. Without such labor, food would be lost.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to bear testimony similar to that offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. In my State the movement into this country of Canadian labor to help us harvest our potato crop is indispensable at the present time. Last year in one county of my State we had a crop of approximately 70,000,000 bushels of potatoes. Without this help having been brought in from the outside, millions of bushels of potatoes would have been ruined.

We have a similar situation in respect to our woods operations. There is not available in the State or in the surrounding territory a sufficient number of woodsmen to carry on woods operations and all the industries dependent upon those operations. The pending measure would make it possible to furnish a source of labor supply which is absolutely necessary in the two occupations to which I have referred.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I merely wish to make an inquiry. As I understand, un-

der the provisions of existing law, laborers are brought in from Central and South America and certain other areas.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are all brought from this hemisphere.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Are not some brought from the Bahamas?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the provisions of the law, they must be native-born. Is that statement correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that there is any such requirement in the law, but they are brought only from countries in this hemisphere.

Mr. HAYDEN. They must be native-born when imported. In order to facilitate agricultural employment the law provides that they must be native-born residents of North America, South America, or Central America.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, this country cannot be used as a clearing ground for immigration from other countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. Every precaution in the world has been taken in the joint resolution to guard against laborers being allowed to come into this country in the way referred to by the Senator. They must return to the countries whence they came.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that, but they must be native-born residents of some country in this hemisphere before they are allowed to come into this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Referring to the new subsection (c) which we have been discussing, I understood the Senator to say that seven regional offices are involved.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. With about 100 employees in each office.

Mr. McKELLAR. The average is more than 100. One thousand three hundred and ninety-six persons are employed outside Washington to administer the law. Most of them are in the regional offices. I will give the Senator the exact number. I refer to the table on page 196 of the hearings where it will be seen that the number of employees at the first office is 101, at the next 153, at the next 62, at the next 78, at the next 78, at the next 72. In San Francisco there are 135 and in Portland, Oreg., there are 62. The total number employed at regional offices is 663.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. When it was decided to abolish regional offices, was it the belief of the committee that the several hundred employees—whatever the exact number may be—would be removed from the pay roll or shunted over into some other department?

Mr. McKELLAR. That would depend on those in control of the organization. I have no doubt that the employees will be moved largely to the places where the work is done. I use Los Angeles as an illustration because every Senator knows that it is the center of a large fruit industry. Instead of being used in San

Francisco, the employees will no doubt be moved to Los Angeles.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I understood the Senator to state that the reason for abolishing the regional offices was in the interest of economy and getting rid of administrative expenses. If those employees are to be simply shunted over into another job, with another name, what will be accomplished?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will yield to me I think I can explain the situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The handling of aliens in the United States is an expensive operation because it is necessary to keep books on each individual alien. That is done in the first place to insure that he will leave the United States when his time is up. We identify him, we fingerprint him, we make that record of him, and keep track of him all the time.

The second reason why it is necessary to keep books with him is, as I have heretofore stated, that a part of his pay is deducted and sent back to his home. In the agreement with the foreign country it is provided that he shall receive the prevailing rate of wages in the area where he is employed and, in order to insure that being done, it is necessary to know about the contract which is made with the farmer who employs him. That involves more bookkeeping. Somebody has to keep that record.

We want to be sure that he is deported after he is through with his work. We have to have the record in order to keep the bargain we made with his government that a part of his pay will be sent home. That has to be done anyway; but what we are trying to get away from is a policy-making office that did not perform these functions, which are required under the agreements with foreign governments.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator for his explanation, but I want to ask one further question if the Senator from Tennessee will pardon me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I know it is necessary and that it has to be done, but the major portion of the work of the regional offices, if I understand their operations correctly, is in dealing with our own people and moving them around, and not so much with the aliens. The aliens are a minority group as compared with all farm labor.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken about that. The number of aliens brought in last year was between seventy and eighty thousand. We have need this year for twice that many—for 150,000 if we can get them. The actual supervised movement last year from one State to another was only about 20,000, according to the record. What the Senator has in mind is the movement within a State, and that was wholly transferred to the Extension Service in each State. It is not necessary at all to deal with the matter in the regional offices, except to the extent that there has sometimes to be moved from one State to another certain equipment which is needed. There

the Federal end of it comes in, but, so far as the handling of intractable labor is concerned, last year it was completely transferred to the Extension Service in the State, and it operated, I think, successfully, and it does not need extensive Federal supervision.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. What I wanted to know particularly was what is going to happen to the seven or eight hundred employees of the regional offices, and if we are going to save the amount represented by their salaries, or whether they are merely to be assigned elsewhere.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, we spend approximately \$300,000,000 for Puerto Rico to support the population there because it is claimed that the island is over-populated. I want to know what attempt has been made to bring Puerto Ricans to this country to perform farm labor here?

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been no attempt to do that.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, we send them money to support them and then pay laborers from other countries to come here and work for us.

Mr. McKELLAR. We do in this particular instance; yes.

Mr. LANGER. Many Mexicans come to this country to work in the sugar fields of North Dakota, and they have done a good job. Before the war they paid their own expenses to our State, but since the war the Government, apparently, has been paying all the expenses of transportation and everything else.

Mr. McKELLAR. We pay the transportation and then those who employ the imported laborers pay them for their work. It is absolutely necessary. Last year a great many of these workers helped gather the crops in North Dakota, and I am very glad they did because North Dakota aided in the production of food that is so necessary in the war effort at this time. It is somewhat expensive, it is true, but it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. LANGER. Do not any of the foreign countries contribute anything toward the support and the transportation of these workers?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; the Government puts up the money to bring them to the ports of entry and then those who employ them pay them for their work.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to record at this time that in the committee I voted against turning all this program over to the War Food Administrator, instead of putting it into the hands of the State extension services. I should like to have it recorded that last year 3,500,000 placements of farm workers were handled by the extension services, and they spent only \$5,700,000 out of the \$14,000,000 that was made available to them, and they returned the difference to the Treasury. The House joint resolution provided that when the foreign laborers were brought into the States

they would be turned over to the extension services. I still think it would be a good thing to have the measure go to conference with that idea in mind. That will be the case, will it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; the joint resolution will go to conference in that form.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not want the impression to be created that the Senate is not supporting the committee in that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is one of vital importance. I completely disagree with the statement made by the junior Senator from Illinois. So far as the number of placements is concerned, it is obvious that because the Extension Service had the placements of those who were residents in the county or within the State it naturally made a great many more placements at much less expense, but the foreign laborers represented the difference between success and failure of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of valuable food in this country. They had to be brought in from the outside; they had to be handled in an entirely different way. So I want the RECORD to show that I think the committee was a hundred percent right in the amendment which the Senate has now adopted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I had the same idea as the Senator from Illinois entertains when we first began consideration of the matter. I think the Farm Extension Service has done a wonderful work in this country. I think it is one of the best organizations in the Federal service. I have the greatest respect and admiration for it. I think it is doing now a great work. But when the joint resolution came before the Senate committee, Mr. Jones, the War Food Administrator, appeared and testified that his organization did not want it to take the course suggested by the Senator from Illinois. They preferred that it should follow the successful course that was taken last year.

Then, came Mr. M. L. Wilson, head of the Farm Extension Service, and he testified that they did not want to handle the matter. Somehow or other, I do not like to put on a public officer additional duties, particularly such important duties as these, when he himself says that he does not want it. Others said the same thing, and the heads of the land-grant colleges came and testified the same way.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Including Dean Martin.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, Dean Martin, as the Senator suggests. So, although I had the idea that it might be done more economically and probably just as well or better by the Farm Extension Service, I came to the conclusion that, in view of its success last year along the line that was then adopted, and as we did not intend to make it a permanent organization but only one to operate during the war period, undoubtedly we had better stick to the law as it was last year. The principal reason was that the Extension Service did not want to take it, and the other reason was the success of the undertaking last year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will permit, I do not wish to take the time to read Dean Martin's statement on behalf of the Land Grant College Association, but it is clear from his statement, which appears at page 142 and following of the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That the Extension Service and the land-grant colleges feel that they are primarily engaged in the field of education, and they do not want this temporary wartime operating job dumped in their laps. I may not use language which the dean would approve, but that is the substance of their statement. I ask that the statement be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DEAN WILLIAM H. MARTIN, OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, REPRESENTING THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LAND GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

FUNCTION OF EXTENSION SERVICE

The Cooperative Extension Service is a joint activity of the State land-grant colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture. Its purpose, as set forth by the Congress in the basic Smith-Lever Act, is "to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of same." Congress specified further that its work "shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations . . . and imparting . . . information. . . ."

Thus the Extension Service from the outset has been construed to be an educational agency, an organic arm of the cooperative educational program originally established with the passage of the Land Grant Act, and now specifically defined to include the fields of resident teaching, research, and extension teaching. The Extension Service personnel is qualified, by training and experience, to work most efficiently in this field. In the judgment of the Land Grant College Association, the best long-time interests of the people will be served by continuing the permanent program of the land-grant colleges within the sphere of activities that may be regarded as purely educational in nature.

COOPERATION OF EXTENSION SERVICE IN WAR EFFORT

Under war conditions, however, it is recognized that the total mobilization of our national resources may require that many individuals and agencies pursue activities lying outside their traditional fields. The land-grant colleges have accepted, and will continue to accept, such extraordinary responsibilities in the field of agriculture as the Congress may feel they are best qualified to bear. It is assumed, of course, that such emergency assignments of responsibilities will carry with them the means with which to fulfill them.

This is a general statement of policy designed to promote the most effective utilization of the facilities of the land-grant colleges in furtherance of the war effort. It is felt that the specific application of this policy

to the farm-labor program should be developed by the Congress.

ATTITUDE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TOWARD TRANSFERRING TO EXTENSION SERVICE HANDLING OF FOREIGN AND INTERSTATE LABOR

The executive committee doubts, however, if the Extension Service is so organized or equipped as to operate effectively in the field of interstate or international movement of farm labor. It also looks with much concern on too close involvement of the county extension agents in matters having to do with agricultural deferments by the selective-service boards. The Extension Service must work amicably with all farmers.

Obviously, the Extension Service is ready and willing to furnish Congress with all available information concerning the requirements for farm labor which must be met to enable farmers to continue maximum production of the agricultural products so necessary to the war effort.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not intend to put anything in the RECORD, but I do want the RECORD to show that this is not all one-sided. There were three heads of various State extension services who testified to the absolute essentiality and indispensability of this foreign labor to their successful crop harvesting.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Everyone admits that it is necessary. The question of who handles it is an entirely different problem. The heads of the extension service in Tennessee, in Minnesota, and in Maryland came and testified that there was a duplication of effort, that the farmers in their communities were acquainted with them, that they are in the area the year round, and that the farmers brought all their problems to them, and brought this labor problem to them also. I merely want the RECORD to show that I think the best way to handle the matter is through the Extension Service, and I hope that out of the conference the bill may come back with that provided for.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Illinois is correct in all he says about the testimony and about his position, which to me has a great deal of merit. The only reason why I approved the amendment is the reason I have given.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the observation should be made for the RECORD, in connection with the question of foreign labor, that the foreign governments would, I think, much prefer to have an agency directly representing the Central Government rather than several agencies which may be said to be partially Federal, but are mostly State organizations, represented by 48 different agricultural extension agencies throughout the United States.

There will be found in the record of the Senate committee hearings, at page 132, a letter written by our representative in Mexico to the Secretary of State in Washington, showing, in substance, that the Mexican Government views with alarm an undertaking, on the part of the House through the pending bill, to take the authority out of the hands of the Federal Government, and place it in the hands of the State governments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 9, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous provisions," on page 9, line 10, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 15, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 18, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 9, after the word "receipts", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That all receipts derived from the furnishing of subsistence to workers shall be credited to the appropriation in section 1 and be available for expenditure by the Administrator for the replenishment of subsistence supplies and for expenses incident to the furnishing of such subsistence."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona how much was derived from subsistence last year, and to what extent this amendment would curtail the operations.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would not affect it at all. The amendment would merely do away with the revolving fund. We were told in the hearings, if my recollection is correct, that about \$12,000,000 was collected from imported labor for meals furnished them. They have to pay for their meals. Under the procedure followed, the \$12,000,000 was deposited in the Treasury. The House language, as we interpret it, would make it a revolving fund which could be used over and over again.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What I rose to ask was whether the effect of the amendment would be actually to reduce the amount of money available for this work for this year. If it amounts to \$12,000,000, which they were able to collect as they went along with the program last year, and then used for further expenditures, it would seem to me—although here again I plead that I am not sufficiently familiar with the matter, for the reasons I have already stated, to speak with authority—that the net effect would be to curtail the operating funds, assuming a program of equal magnitude with that of last year, to the extent of about \$12,000,000. Yet I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say that we need twice as many laborers this year as we had last year.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Tennessee will explain how it is handled in another way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Last year, while we appropriated money for this purpose, none of it was used. The provision was found ineffective, as it was managed. So there is set up this year a different method, which enlarges and increases the work and takes care of it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So, as a matter of fact, the amendment will not result in curtailing the amount of money available for this year's operations, be-

cause the funds are put into the general fund, instead of being used as a revolving fund?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 10, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 18, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 6, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title"; and in line 7, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 11, after the word "perishable", to strike out "or seasonal fruits and vegetables" and insert "agricultural products."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 12, to strike out:

(1) Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the act approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 132), funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the current migration of Mexican or Canadian nationals under the auspices of the War Manpower Commission for industrial and railroad purposes essential to the war effort, may continue to be expended during the fiscal year 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 20, before the word "This", to strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)"; in the same line, before the word "shall", to strike out "act" and insert "title"; and in line 23, after the word "this", to strike out "act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 23, to insert:

(j) If the Administrator finds that there is inadequate farm labor in any area, the Administrator and the agricultural extension service of the land-grant colleges in the respective States are hereby authorized for the purposes of this title, to negotiate directly with the War Department for the utilization of prisoners of war and the emergency use of soldiers of the United States for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States upon such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed upon, subject, in the case of prisoners of war, to the terms of any treaties or international agreements to which the United States of America is signatory and which are now in effect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to obtain information about the reasons for this amendment. As it strikes me at first reading, the amendment would have the effect of treating war prisoners, as a part of the seasonal labor force, differently from the treatment accorded those who are brought in from abroad, and that it would cut off any activity heretofore undertaken by the Administrator and the War Manpower Commission. Am I correct or wrong about that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Essentially, of course, there is a difference between a prisoner of war and a free alien who comes into the country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly; but so far as the total labor supply is concerned, it would seem to me they should all be considered as available, and we should not have more concentration of war prisoners in one place when there is a greater demand for them somewhere else.

Mr. HAYDEN. The complaint made to the committee by the American Farm Bureau Federation was that in a number of instances, where there were available within a State or an area prisoners of war who could do agricultural work, it took so long a time to unwind the red tape and get them that the crops were lost. Instead of having them go around through the War Manpower Commission, and every other agency which has been interested in the matter heretofore, the amendment would provide that if the Administrator felt that there was an inadequate farm-labor supply in any area, then he, or the land-grant college, could go directly to the Army and get the matter fixed up. It would simply cut red tape. That is all it is designed to do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the Senator will make further study of this matter. It struck me that, instead of having the number of war prisoners available considered with the total labor supply, and allocated and sent to places in relation to the total demand, the net effect of the amendment would be that the war prisoners would be segregated and made available directly to the local communities without the consideration of the over-all problem.

For example, there may be a shortage of labor in one State and there may be a greater shortage of labor in another. It would seem to me that in meeting that problem the war prisoners should be sent where there is the greatest need, rather than segregated and utilized as a separate labor force.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will permit, that is exactly what we directed the Administrator to do. The amendment provides, "If the Administrator finds that there is inadequate farm labor in any area," and so forth. He finds it in relation to all other areas, which is his business, he being the head of the national organization, and the War Food Administrator. If he finds that there is a shortage in any area, he can go directly to the War Department and say, "You have in this area certain prisoners of war, and we would like to use them." I cannot see any objection to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me call attention to the testimony of Mr. O'Neal, head of the Farm Bureau Federation, which appears on page 66 of the committee hearings:

Experience has already demonstrated the need for definite authority to enable the Federal Office of Extension and the State extension offices to negotiate directly with the War Department for the utilization of prisoners of war, and also for the emergency use of soldiers in the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities. At the present time it is necessary to go through a maze of red tape, restrictions, and delays imposed by

the War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service. While all this procedure is going on, needed food supplies may be lost. Serious losses have already occurred in some areas.

That is the reason for this provision, and it seems to me to be admirably stated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am still not convinced, but the matter will go to conference. What I am concerned about is that there shall not be any separate use of the war prisoners in an area simply because there is a shortage there, as against the perhaps more important and urgent need for them somewhere else. It seems to me that this provision for direct negotiation with the War Department separates them and gives them different treatment than is accorded those who are brought in from other countries or are transported in interstate commerce.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be, but it results in considerable saving of food crops.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the Senator will consider this angle of the situation, because it seems to me it would be very unfortunate if what I am apprehensive about should occur.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt it will be thoroughly gone over in conference.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it was my experience, in trying to have my own State of Louisiana avail itself of war prison labor last season, especially in the case of the rice crop and the sugarcane crop, that there was considerable delay, and I think if we can have direct negotiation and obtain quicker action it will probably be much better. I am not criticizing anyone. We did receive war prison labor eventually in the sugarcane fields, which practically saved the crop. I think it has been estimated that as much as 50 percent of that crop would have been lost had we not obtained the prison labor. It was of great help in the rice crop also, as well as the cotton crop. I mention the cane and the rice crops because they are both so very essential to the prosecution of the war. But we ought to avoid as much as possible red tape and delays in obtaining the prison labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 13, beginning in line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 12, after the word "This", to strike out "act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 13, to insert:

TITLE II—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Migration of workers: To enable the War Manpower Commission to provide, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Chairman of said Commission, for the temporary migration of workers from foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere

(pursuant to agreements between the United States and such foreign countries) for employment in the continental United States with industries and services essential to the preservation, marketing, or distribution of agricultural products, including the transportation of such workers from points outside the United States to ports of entry of the United States and return (including transportation from place of employment in the United States to port of entry of the United States in any case of default by an employer to provide such transportation to a worker, in which event the employer shall be liable to the United States for the cost thereof), cost of temporary maintenance of workers in reception centers in foreign countries and in the United States, when necessary, reasonable subsistence and emergency medical care of such workers from the time of reporting for transportation to the United States or return to the country of origin until arrival at the destination, necessary assistance to meet emergency health and welfare problems while in the United States, when such assistance is not otherwise available to such persons, and guaranties of employment while in the United States to the extent agreed upon with the foreign country from which the worker is imported, fiscal year 1944, \$1,359,200, of which not to exceed \$97,200 shall be available for all administrative expenses necessary for the foregoing, including not to exceed \$10,000 for temporary employment of administrative personnel outside continental United States, not to exceed \$1,000 for printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and not to exceed \$20,000 for travel expenses: *Provided*, That no transportation of workers shall be allowed hereunder unless the employer and the worker have entered into a contract for employment approved by said Chairman or his designee, and unless said Chairman certifies that reasonably adequate use is being made of local labor supply: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall remain available after June 30, 1944, for the purpose of fulfilling guaranties and other obligations theretofore incurred with respect to such foreign workers and for all other purposes connected with the protection and ultimate return of any workers theretofore transported: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the recruitment or transportation of workers for employment in agriculture: *Provided further*, That the general provisions under the caption "Executive Office of the President—Office for Emergency Management," contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, and applicable to the constituent agencies of the Office for Emergency Management contained therein shall be applicable to the appropriations to the War Manpower Commission contained in this paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation of the amendment. There is a very serious shortage of labor in the woods to cut trees to make wood pulp and to cut timber to make containers for fruits and vegetables. In my own State, in the Salt River Valley, we lost 500 carloads of winter lettuce because the box shook could not be obtained to put the lettuce in boxes and fit them for shipment. Under those circumstances, knowing that to be a fact, and knowing how short paper is for newspapers—I had it all confirmed by a letter from one of the leading agricultural journals of the Pacific coast, which stated that if foreign labor could be obtained that was familiar with working in the woods, it would be a

great help. They thought that they knew where such labor was, and on inquiry I found that the place they had in mind was British Honduras.

In British Honduras they have had a large mahogany industry for a long time, and many men skilled in cutting mahogany trees, but the demand for mahogany wood during the war is almost nil. So the British Government took 600 of these British Honduran woodsmen to Scotland, and they have been employed there cutting down a pine forest which grew up since the last war. That operation is about complete and they will soon be on their way back.

A number of other of these woodsmen went from British Honduras to the Panama Canal, and helped to clear the right-of-way for the third set of locks, and that operation is about completed.

So it is known that in that particular area at least 1,500 skilled men could be obtained to go into the woods. The same is true of the tropical forests of Mexico and Central America and other countries.

I took the matter up with the War Manpower Commission and asked, "What is necessary to be done to find this labor?" and this text was submitted, in the form of an amendment, which has been adopted by the committee. The committee has confined it, Senators will observe, to enable the War Manpower Commission to provide for the admission by agreement with foreign governments of their nationals into this country to be employed in the continental United States with industries and services essential to the preservation, marketing, or distribution of agricultural products.

Timber, according to a Federal statute, is an agricultural product. It will be very helpful indeed if this work can be carried on. The difference between the procedure and that with respect to the importation of agricultural labor is that our Government will pay the expenses from the country of origin to a port of entry in the United States. From there the rail transportation must be paid by the employer in the United States. That is what is now being done under the allotment from the President's fund with respect to railroad workers.

There are now about 12,000 Mexicans in the United States employed as track workers, largely by the Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe railroads. They sent down to Mexico their own locomotives and cars because of the lack of equipment, and they have paid all the rail transportation there and back. But it is done under the same basic agreement with which agricultural labor is imported, that is, that they will return when their work is over, they will receive the prevailing rate of wage, and a deduction is made from their wages as in the case of agricultural labor. But the burden of the employer is greater than it is in the case of agricultural labor.

Mr. President, I thought this explanation was due the Senate before the amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee

amendment beginning in line 14, on page 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

(k) The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained in this title shall be available from and including February 1, 1944, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between January 31, 1944, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I very much regret that I shall have to leave the Chamber. The conferees on the tax bill are meeting at 1:30 and there is one very important amendment coming up there in which I am interested. I had intended to raise some other questions in connection with the joint resolution, but I am unable to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that completes the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 203) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may be granted authority to make necessary changes in section numbers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

JAPANESE BARBARISM AND ATROCITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last night at a late hour I was called over the telephone by one of the press agencies. The representative of the agency read to me a news release issued by the War Department and Navy Department in a joint statement which appears in this morning's newspapers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Eastland	O'Daniel
Andrews	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Robertson
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Bone	Hawkes	Shipstead
Ebrewster	Hayden	Smith
Bridges	Hill	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Langer	Truman
Eutler	Lodge	Tunnell
Eyrd	McClellan	Tydings
Capper	McFarland	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wilson
Downey	Murdoch	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I greatly regret that, because of the absence of so many Senators from the city, the attendance of many Senators at committee meetings, and the absence of other Senators from the Chamber because of other official business, a number of Senators are not now on the floor of the Senate. I do not take that position because I want them to hear what I myself have to say, but because I should like to have every Member of the Senate, every Member of the House of Representatives, and every person in public and private life of this country raise his voice in such a protest that it would reach across the ocean into the enemy's land. I discuss today the terrible story of atrocities committed on American soldiers captured on Bataan and Corregidor.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. President, I was called last night on the telephone, and that story was related to me. The story I was told over the telephone, and as it appears this morning in the newspapers, was and is a story of brutality and barbarism unequalled in the annals of the history of civilized men or nations. The gruesome details are fully set forth in the joint statement issued by the Army and Navy officials. It reveals the tragedy of 5,200 American prisoners of war killed by torture, by starvation—a story of wanton murder and butchery inflicted by the Japanese not only upon American soldiers but upon Filipino soldiers as well.

I quote from the newspaper story:

During an 85-mile "march of death" which began the day of the surrender on Bataan . . .

Americans and Filipinos were not permitted to eat food they had with them.

Unbelievable as it may seem, yet the testimony of eye witnesses discloses as true that our soldiers, and the Filipinos also, who happened to have in their possession Japanese tokens or money were executed in the cruel, barbarous,

and savage manner of actual beheading. Even the sick and disabled from the hospitals were forced into the marching columns, and those who could not march were shot. When on that 85-mile march of death the pangs of thirst overcame the caution and prudence of American boys, and they dashed to roadside wells, they were shot down and killed in cold blood.

At the end of that long march of death 12,000 prisoners were kept for a whole week without food on a concrete floor about 100 yards square. After 7 days the 7,000 Americans and 5,000 Filipinos were given their first food—1 mess kit of rice and a can of sardines.

Mr. President, the relation of further details of this dastardly treatment accorded our soldiers is unnecessary. Every Senator has read the full story as it appears in the newspapers, and this morning every American has learned of the torture, the cruel and barbarous treatment accorded prisoners of war by the so-called modern Japanese Nation.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. I regret that I am required to leave the Chamber in order to attend a meeting in the Ways and Means Committee room of the conferees on the tax bill. I should like to give an expression of my own feeling after reading what appeared in this morning's newspapers. I say that the inhumane and unbelievably barbarous action of the Japanese disqualifies Japan from even being considered one of the civilized nations of the world.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator, and I am in thorough accord with what he has said.

But, Mr. President, the story appearing in the press of this morning is not exactly new to me. It only confirms what I have long dreaded and feared. In that group of American soldiers were many boys from my own State—probably a larger percentage, according to population, than from any other State in the Union. There were men and young men whom I have known, some of them all the years of their lives. Some of those boys I have known since boyhood. I know their fathers and mothers, and count them my close personal friends. With some of the older men I have been associated in business and in friendly and social relations for many, many years. While I have been deeply concerned about the men from every other section of the country, nevertheless, it is but natural that, having had such intimate acquaintance with so many of the men from New Mexico, I have been more deeply concerned, perhaps, with their safety and with their welfare.

At any rate, ever since the fall of Bataan I have tried in every possible way to ascertain what I could about the treatment of those soldiers and have tried to get relief to them and information about them. In various conferences with officials of the various agencies of the Government and of the Red Cross I have received information which

I have not heretofore made public, because I thought it would do no good and perhaps would add further fear and sorrow to the relatives of those men taken prisoner in the Philippines. During these conferences, when I learned that the Japanese people had refused to permit any inspection of or visitation to the prison camps in the Philippines by representatives of neutral nations or by the Red Cross, I was convinced that conditions there were such that the Japanese were afraid to reveal the stark, grim, and naked truth. That truth stands revealed today in a way which shocks and horrifies not only every American, but every decent person throughout the whole civilized world.

Mr. President, the truest possible test of a civilized nation is its treatment of prisoners of war. Always we have known that the uncivilized, the uncultured, the barbarian, has tortured, killed, and cruelly murdered defenseless prisoners taken captive in battle, but as man emerged from the dark ages, from the age of the brute and the beast, when his mind and conscience became awakened to the needless and unjustified torture of helpless captives, he progressed and accorded to prisoners of war that humane treatment which ought to be accorded to those who have laid down their arms and can no longer fight. Mr. President, in the treatment of prisoners lies one of the great advances of civilization; and those peoples and nations which disregarded the civilized rules of decent and honorable treatment of prisoners of war and return again to the barbarous practices of the savage and the uncivilized, demonstrate to the world that the mask of civilization which they present is only a mask and that the thin veneer with which they cover their true natures is stripped and laid aside at the first opportunity and they, the people who do torture, kill, and starve their captives, are, after all, no better than the ancestors of men, who hundreds and thousands of years ago practiced such savage and inhuman methods.

In the story of the three officers, the eye-witnesses, which appears in the newspapers this morning, Japan stands forth in her true colors, as a brutal nation of uncivilized, uncultured, treacherous and deceitful people, a nation which, by its own cruelty, by its own barbarism, and by its own treachery, has forfeited any right to any association with the civilized nations of the world.

For months I have been in contact with members of the Bataan Relief Association. Months ago one of the members of that association prepared a statement on the treatment of prisoners of war by the Japanese, which I had told him I would release to the public at the opportune time. There could be no more fitting time than the present to read verbatim the statement which he prepared last August. I submit his views now to the Senate and to the country, and to the Japanese as well, as the views of the relatives and friends of prisoners captured by the Japanese. These are the views not only of this man, but of all the relatives and friends of prisoners who were captured by the Japanese.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to pay particular attention to this statement, which I read because it comes from a man who has probably as deep concern as it is possible for a man to have, as I shall presently show. I now quote from the statement of this man, a member of the Bataan Relief Association:

Our enemies have made a most grievous mistake—grievous for them. They have taken for granted, most likely as the result of wishful thinking, that we Americans are soft. Their greatest error is their misconception of what activates the motive of being soft, according to their definition of the term. If being the most humanitarian nation on earth is being soft, then we are soft; if extending a helping hand to an honorable fallen foe is being soft, then, again, we are soft, and if moving heaven and earth to see that our fighting men receive humane and dignified treatment from their captors, should they become prisoners of war, is being soft, then, most assuredly, we are soft, and proud of the fact that we are so constituted. We are mighty proud of having these qualities of softness among our most cherished possessions. Why? Because they are the very essentials of the highest degree of modern civilization. No one, more than that, no nation can hope to be considered as even approaching the advanced stages of high civilization unless it is endowed with and abides by these qualities.

It is obvious that, in their interpretation of softness, our enemies have failed to realize that we modern civilized people have the ability to combine humane treatment with the grim determination to be tough—just as tough as any occasion demands. If our foe is tough, we Americans are tougher, and if our foe gets tougher, regardless of how far he goes, we can be and are far more so, the toughest of any nation on earth. Let our foes beware, we are going to win this war. Let their leaders beware, we are going to mete out punishment in a degree corresponding to the extent of their just desserts. That is not vengeance; that is justice.

Among Americans, we recognize no royalty. Every son is entitled to and receives the same degree of respect and affection as any other son. Every son is a prince in his own household. We do not and will not recognize any so-called divine right of kings. We do not pay any attention to what other nations think about this, as it is our prerogative to think and act as we please in this and other matters, such as dealing out justice. That is democracy. If the ruler of a foreign nation, regardless of whether he attains his position by force, duly recognized processes of procedure, or by inheritance, is considered as having the final responsibility in the determination of punishable acts of his subjects, then that ruler must be and will be considered in the punishment meted out for those acts, along with his subjects who actually perform them. He is just as guilty as they are and will be treated accordingly. It will be too late for such a ruler, worshipful though he may have been, to escape the falling leaves from the tree of retribution, as scattered by the winds of justice, which inevitably bring ignominious and dishonorable oblivion. It will be too late that he may have been betrayed and dishonor heaped upon him by his own subjects in the perpetration of acts of barbaric brutality upon their helpless victims. It will be too late to discover that he should have ordered that no such inhumane acts be committed. It was his civilized duty to do so in the beginning and to see to it that he was obeyed even to the extent of demanding extreme punishment for those guilty as the traitors they would have been to him. Any act of cruelty which he could have prevented, and did not, he will be held fully responsible for, while he will be fully compensated for all of

his acts of kindness and mercy. Again, this is not vengeance; this is modern civilized justice.

We American people have consistently and insistently demanded that our prisoners of war be treated according to the rules established for their welfare among most civilized nations. We will continue to so demand. On the other hand, America, again in conformance with the rules of most modern civilization, has always tempered justice with mercy. If our boys and men have been properly cared for, then their captors need have no fear; but, if they have not received everything, including humane treatment, to which they are entitled as the "princes" of America, then whoever is responsible is going to pay and pay in direct proportion with the proof of his or their inhumanitarianism.

We American people are determined to see that several things come to pass. We are determined to win this war as soon as possible, but, regardless of whatever it takes and how long it takes, we will win it. We are also determined that punishment shall be meted out to those guilty of perpetrating this worldwide attempt to destroy the very principles of civilization in proportion to their degree of responsibility and whoever they may be.

Finally, we are determined to see that liberty, peace, and justice are reestablished and permanently maintained throughout the world with our fighting men and their comrades, who make it so, receiving the fullest rewards and highest honors for their deeds of valor and their sacrifices. It must be established once and for all that nothing is too good for our heroic fighting men, wherever they may be. It must be firmly and permanently proved that they have not fought, bled, and died in vain. All of this we Americans demand for our men and boys—our "princes" of America.

I have not used the name of the man who prepared the statement, because in his last letter to me he requested me not to do so. In his letter of transmittal, making the request, he concludes with the following statement:

All I am trying to do is to be the kind of an American God intended me to be. If it (referring to the statement) will accomplish anything by including it in the Record, by all means do so.

I wish, Mr. President, I had not been requested to refrain from using the name of this man, because no person can feel more deeply, or appreciate more fully, the utter horror and desperation which the story this morning reveals than he and his good wife, because their own son was among the 5,200 mentioned in the newspapers today.

Mr. President, I want the Japanese people to read and heed the words of one American father whose son died a prisoner of the Japanese in the Philippines. I want them to know that the cruel and barbarous treatment accorded American prisoners of war will not intimidate or deter a single American soldier abroad, or a single American at home. I want them to know that for every indignity and cruelty practiced and heaped upon prisoners of war, the American will and the American determination will only grow stronger, and that when they, the Japanese, speak of their determination to fight a hundred years, I say to them in behalf of every American, that this country will fight a thousand years, if necessary, to conclude and subdue a nation which violates every rule of humanity, of decency, and of civilization. This

shall be the answer of all America, and, for that matter, for all the nations of the civilized world, to this story of brutality and inhuman treatment of the defenseless and helpless.

We honor and respect a brave and courageous enemy. We can sit down at the peace table and work with the brave and civilized for a fair, just, and honorable peace. But, Mr. President, we cannot treat with the barbarian or the savage.

If Japan has any hope of a place in the sun, if she has any desire to become a civilized and cultured nation, fit to associate with the other nations of the world, she must instantly reverse her whole trend of warfare. She must subscribe to, and practice without any deviation whatever, all the rules of civilized warfare, and all the rules laid down at the Geneva Convention.

She must treat prisoners of war as we treat prisoners of war. Restrain them from further combat duty, yes; that is in accord with the principles of warfare conducted among civilized peoples. We restrain those we capture and keep them prisoners so they shall no longer engage in combat against us, but we treat them fairly, decently, and honorably. No Japanese prisoners, no German prisoners, and no Italian prisoners of war will receive anything at the hands of the United Nations but just, fair, and decent treatment. We demand from the enemy that kind of treatment for our own soldiers.

Surely, Mr. President, there must be in the Japanese Empire some Japanese persons who sincerely desire to progress and advance with the other civilized nations of the world. There must be some who would like to have commercial and social contact with the other nations when this cruel war is ended. There must be some who abhor the cruel and barbarous practices of which we read today. In those persons, if there be such, lies the hope of the future of Japan.

The world can live without Japan; Japan cannot live without the world. If the short-sighted policies of the Japanese war lords continue to prevail, and if war is continued in the inhuman and uncivilized manner with which the Japanese have thus far conducted it from the day of Pearl Harbor to the tragedy of the "march of death," and perhaps long since, the civilized nations will have but one recourse, namely, to see that when victory comes, as it will eventually come to the United Nations, the Japanese will be forever isolated within the borders and confines of their little islands, and never again allowed any contact with the outside world. Cruel and unchristianlike does this sound? Not at all. We isolate all our own criminals at Alcatraz and keep them there for life. The United Nations can isolate the Japanese on their own islands and keep them there for life, or until that day arrives when Japan voluntarily renounces and forever abandons the deceit, treachery, and inhumanity of the savage and the barbarian. The future of Japan will lie in her own hands; her own conduct will make her own future. If she chooses to

live by the sword, then by the grace of God she shall die by the sword.

Mr. President, I wish to say just one more word. Recently, statements have appeared in the press of the Nation about a great movement for peace now—a negotiated peace. In a speech one of the leaders of that movement declared publicly that the Japanese and the Germans were no worse than the British and the Americans. Let every person in this land read the story of the torture and cruelty practiced by the Japanese, and then realize that there is no peace now, there can be no peace now, and that there will be no negotiated peace, or any other kind of peace until the enemies are defeated completely and have unconditionally surrendered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in a brief word I wish to associate myself with other Members of this body, and with all the people of the United States, in condemnation of the incredible acts of that pagan outfit which calls itself the government in Japan.

For many years we have boasted in the United States that it was a great admiral of our Navy, Admiral Perry, in 1854, who removed the veil from Japanese mystery and seclusion and opened Japan to civilization and to the civilized world. Acts such as those about which we have read today make us doubt whether Admiral Perry ever opened Japan to civilization or whether anybody could under any conditions, over any period of years, open up Japan to civilization.

There are no words in the English language in which the condemnation of every patriotic and humane heart can be clothed in expressing not simply resentment, not simply indignation, but a deep revulsion to the brutalities, the cynicism, and the utter indifference of the Japanese Government to all the decencies which are supposed to exist among nations that are entitled to belong to the great family of nations.

We have heard a great deal about punishment of those in Europe who have perpetrated not only the war but those who have perpetrated ruthless murder. We know that millions of Europeans have been murdered by the Fascists and the Nazis, not in warfare, not while in the uniform of their country, but because they belonged to one race or one religion to which they had a right to belong and to adhere.

We have not heard so much up to now about the punishment, the personal and physical punishment, of the war lords of Japan. I am quite certain that neither the American people nor any other people who inhabit any of the United Nations nor any decent or self-respecting people who inhabit any other nation, even an enemy nation, will be satisfied with anything less than the personal punishment of those in Japan who have been guilty ever since Pearl Harbor on the 7th of December 1941, of the unspeakable atrocities of which we have heard and read.

When we have one by one taken from Japan what she has stolen from other nations, when we have driven her war

lords back into the war hatchery out of which they have been spawned, I hope that the United Nations will see to it by every method within their power, not only as a punishment for the guilty but as a warning to all future conduct of that sort, that every one of those who have been guilty of these atrocities will be punished as if they had been caught red-handed in murder upon the streets of any of our cities and executed because of their criminal and bestial acts.

Mr. President, a small organization from my own State which belonged to and was a part of our National Guard organization from Harrodsburg, Ky., Mercer County, and other sections but particularly Harrodsburg were caught on Bataan. Some of them were killed before the surrender of Bataan. Those remaining were taken prisoners. I have sought information from the War Department as to the identity of the 5,200 who have been murdered. I have not as yet been able to ascertain their identity. So, I am not able to say whether any of those who were members of this particular organization are included as the victims of this unspeakable, incredible, hellish atrocity of which we have heard and read. As they are my friends and neighbors, I would naturally hope that they had been spared, but of course there is no assurance of that. But if they had been, every one of them, it would not lessen my indignation and my resentment and my feeling of personal outrage that members of military organizations from any other State, who are just as dear to us even as our own neighbors, had been cruelly and brutally treated. Their murder we resent and reproach with the same fervor with which we reproach that of our own neighbors.

So far as I am concerned—and I believe the American people, if they could all speak, would say the same thing—I am impatient for the time to arrive when retribution will be meted out to these heathens, these uncivilized pagans, these brutes and beasts in the form of men, and only in the form of men. We may have to be patient until that hour arrives, but it will arrive, Mr. President, as certainly as there is a God in heaven.

Somewhere in the Bible it is said, "Vengeance is mine. I will repay, saith the Lord"; but I do not think that quotation had any reference to situations such as those which face us as a result of this Japanese horror. I think in that respect we will help the Lord repay in vengeance when the time arrives for us to share in that responsibility, which we will be glad to do.

For the moment that is all I have to say.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I simply wish to associate myself with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in their denunciation of the infamy, the outrage, and the unspeakable brutality of the Japanese.

I hope, Mr. President, the day is not far distant when our armed forces, together with those of the Chinese, the Dutch, the Australians, the British, and, when the time is ripe, the Russians, may

hop directly to the islands and to the heart of Japan and bomb and burn and scorch them with fire and teach the Japanese that war is indeed hell in all its fury.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to join with the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and others who have expressed their horror at the news of this morning. The President of the United States spoke of December 7, 1941, as a day of treachery and of infamy. The word which comes to us today, through the press of America, is proof that the people of Japan with whom we are at war have plunged to new depths of barbarism. There is no example in all the span of time of such a degeneration and such a degradation of a people.

Mr. President, there is in this life a law of compensation, rewards for things well done, and a law of retribution for violence against the laws of man and the laws of God. I join in the hope that retribution will come, not alone to the Army, but to the authorities and to the people of Japan, for their atrocities. I hope retribution will come with a terrible and swift sword, and that it will fall upon all in that nation who are responsible for the events of the last 2 years, culminating in this outstanding breach of every human consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. The story of the brutal and inhuman treatment of helpless prisoners of war in the Philippines by the Japanese is indeed shocking to anyone who has any civilized instincts. However, I cannot say that this statement of horrors, as terrible as it is, is in any measure surprising to me. As Members of the Senate know, it was my privilege last summer to spend more than 2 months in daily contact with the men of our armed forces in a trip that carried me to every front of this global war.

Anyone visiting the men who are fighting the war against Germany and then moving into the theaters of conflict with the Japanese will be impressed by the striking contrast in the attitude of the troops fighting against Germany as compared with those who have been in action against the Japs. The men who have fought the Germans either from the air or on the ground recognize them as a determined, a ruthless, and a resourceful enemy. Our men have made up their minds to defeat Germany completely. Each day they are tightening the coils which are choking Germany into submission.

Everyone expects to see due punishment meted out to those responsible for the crimes which have been committed by the Nazi leaders in Europe, but the attitude of our soldiers toward his enemy in the field is more or less impersonal. He is regarded as an enemy who is an obstacle to victory, and those enemies must either be killed or captured before victory can be achieved.

Wherever I came in contact with the American soldier who is facing the Jap, whether in China or India or on the is-

lands of the Pacific, a different attitude is found from that which prevails in Europe. Every American soldier who has seen service against the Japs is imbued with such a personal hatred for all Japs that it is almost terrifying.

There is a simple reason for this. The tales of brutality released today are not all of those which must be written in the Book of Doomsday for proper treatment when the hour of retribution finally comes and the Jap war lords are beaten to their knees. The boys in China, in India, on the islands of New Guinea and Guadalcanal, and indeed everywhere the Jap has been engaged in battle, have their own stories of incredible cruelty, some of them even surpassing in horror those related in this statement. Nearly every one of them has heard first-hand accounts of comrades personally known to them who were victims of Japanese bestiality. These men from first-hand contacts known that the Japs are brutish beings without an instinct of humanity, though in human form. The American Indian was called a savage because of his use of the scalping knife and the fiery stake, but he was a chivalrous cavalier when compared to the Japs and their diabolical methods of torturing the sick, the wounded, and the helpless who fall into their hands.

If the Japanese thought to frighten us with their barbarity, they have made a grievous mistake, which will seal their doom. These acts have only increased the fighting spirit of our men, and strengthened their determination to destroy our enemies.

The hope has been expressed here that when the victory is finally won the perpetrators of these atrocities will not be permitted to escape, but that they will be punished for their infamous crimes. Senators need not worry about these crimes being forgotten or forgiven. The men who have carried the battle to the Japs and know the extent of their cruelty will not let us forget or forgive. They will demand vengeance for the blood of their comrades, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth with compound interest.

The American people will not forget or forgive these arch criminals, even in the joy which will accompany the day of peace. We are slow to anger, but the heart and conscience of the American people are so shocked that the cry for vengeance will not still until punishment commensurate with the crime has been visited upon the guilty. To do less would be a breach of faith with the heroes of Bataan who fell in the "March of Death." Without proper punishment for the infamous beheading of the fliers who bombed Tokyo, neither the soul of those heroes nor the conscience of the American people could ever be at peace. Punishment must be had for every drop of blood from the veins of American prisoners, including the wounded and sick, who have been bayoneted or beaten while helpless to defend themselves. We owe this to the memory of those who have died for us on the far-flung fronts of the Pacific. We owe it to those who will return bearing the scars of the wounds

sustained in our defense. To do less would dishonor us as a people.

Not only does eternal justice demand retribution and vengeance for these crimes, but, Mr. President, we have a responsibility to the future. The surest way to assure a permanent peace on earth is to make such an example of the brutal and barbarous war lords of Japan that in the future the memory of that example will deter criminals of similar bent for a thousand years from the perpetration of such inhuman acts.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the minority leader and the majority leader and other Senators who have spoken about the terrible news conveyed to us this morning.

The attack on Pearl Harbor united America in a determination to enter the war. The atrocities just reported unite America today in a determination to continue and to win the war, as nothing else could have done. They unite us in a determination to fight the war to complete victory in both hemispheres.

Mr. President, this year, 1944, is the critical year of our generation. We can win in this year, or next, or whenever victory comes, only through united, hard work, united service on the front lines, in the factories, on the farms, in the homes, and in the Congress, wherever we may be. If we are to carry out our obligation, we must lift our daily work at home and here above party, above prejudice, above personalities. If we are to win with a spirit that is worthy of those who serve in the front lines, we must win in a spirit of unity.

We properly dedicate ourselves, therefore, to the winning of the war. But we dedicate ourselves also to something more—to a just and a lasting and a living peace following the war. We will not be doing our duty adequately to the men who fight and win the war unless after the war is won it shall stay won. It is only thus that a repetition of what has just happened in this war can be prevented.

Mr. President, there must be a leadership that will draw us and draw all mankind forward, so that such a thing will not happen again, and so there may be an enduring peace. What we need at this time is a deep faith in our God and a deep faith in the men and the purposes of America. Such a faith, widely shared, will make it impossible for such acts as those just reported to happen again. Such a faith, translated into action, is the necessary foundation of peace on earth.

America is a nation created for service to God and man. Our generation owes it to its forefathers and to its descendants alike to make that purpose secure. It is for us, with the quiet and invincible faith of those who have gone before, and of those who believe deeply in God and man, to dedicate ourselves anew to the purposes of America, that she and her purposes and ideals may endure now and forever.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not care to take the time of the Senate, but I have listened to the remarks made by the distinguished acting minority

leader and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], as well as several of our associates on the other side of the aisle. I join with them in everything they say about the outrages perpetrated by Japan. It is a shocking thing to the American people to know what actually occurred. I join with them in condemning these atrocities as savagery and barbarism of the worst sort. Let me call the attention of the Senate and of the country as a whole to the fact that in 1937, when I joined with another Senator, a Democrat, Senator Berry of Tennessee, in trying to prevent the shipment of scrap iron and steel to Japan, material which has since been used in killing innocent Chinese and in killing American boys, this administration, then in power, opposed such legislation because they indicated that they did not want to offend Japan. I warned then what might occur, but my warning reached only deaf ears.

Let me also call attention to the fact that down through the years, at the time of the sinking of the *Panay* and other incidents, when I urged a firm and realistic attitude, the same position was taken by this administration—they did not want to offend Japan.

I also call attention to the fact that just a few months ago, when I offered an amendment to cut the appropriation for the Relocation Authority for caring for the Japanese in this country, which amendment was adopted by the Senate with the support of both Republicans and Democrats, this cut was knocked out in conference, and the excuse given was, "We don't want to offend Japan or give Japan excuses. The Japs are savages and torture for enjoyment. They have in the past, and they will continue."

Mr. President, it is about time that the administration and the people of this country should approach this problem from a realistic point of view. We are shocked, we are horrified, at what has happened; but we know it has been going on for some time. When the cut in appropriations to which I referred was under consideration, the misdeeds and outrages which have now been made public had already occurred, and many of us knew in a general way about them. So let us approach things from a realistic point of view from now on. Let us face the situation that confronts Americans who are prisoners of the Japs.

Mr. President, I agree with every Senator present that Japan as a nation should be wiped off the face of the earth, and that those who committed the outrages should be called to account. What the Japs have done is inhuman, and we must pledge ourselves to deal with them accordingly. But it is sad to think that some leaders have catered to the Japs in the past and others generally have countenanced this attitude on behalf of our Government toward Japan. I say to the Senate that if we had had courageous and realistic persons in certain positions of importance over the years past Japan perhaps might never would have gotten into the position of being able to wage the war as she has and in turn to commit the outrages she

has committed in the past few months and years.

Mr. President, I am glad our eyes are all opened today, and so let us as a United Nation, regardless of political party, pledge ourselves to wage this war as an American people and Nation until this inhuman treatment inflicted upon defenseless American prisoners of war in violation of all international rules be avenged. Let us not stop until we are in Tokyo and the persons responsible for these outrages pay the penalty.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, in my opinion, if there ever was a day in American history when there should be absolute unity in the Congress of the United States, it is today. After reading of the atrocities described in this morning's newspapers, it seems to me there should be not the slightest indication of disunity today, but we should be united—all of us. I regret that anything which even smacks of disunity should be pronounced today.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, and in line with the eloquent statements made by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]; the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I wish to say that I am convinced that the barbarians of Japan suffer from the delusion that the rising sun is a protective charm over their lives and island empire, and that so long as the sun rises over Japan nothing harmful can happen to them. It is probably the same kind of charm that we read of in Macbeth. But to the Japanese people, to the Japanese war lords, to Tojo and Hirohito, I say, "Despair thy charm" because some day—and I hope it will be in the not too distant future—a morning will come when the sun will not rise on Japan. The Japanese people will know that a miracle has happened. They will know that their doom has come, for in place of the rising sun they will see the sky fill with clouds of American airplanes in such number, and piloted by Americans of such skill and courage, that the entire sun will be blotted out. On that morning the sun will not rise on Japan, and the bombs that will drop from those American planes will wreak a vengeance on Japan which will satisfy every mother's and every father's heart which has been wrung today by reading of the fiendish atrocities which have been committed on our defenseless sons in the Asiatic and Pacific theaters of war.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which was re-

ferred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Joseph J. Clark, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of April 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Campbell White, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HATCH. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HATCH. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 31, 1944, at 11 a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 24), 1944:

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Philip Doddridge, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from November 29, 1940.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lt. John Edward Fritz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Frederick Grinnell White, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Gallagher, Medical Corps, with rank from February 8, 1944.

Lt. Col. John Murray Welch, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 9, 1944.

Lt. Col. Harry Aloysius Bishop, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 9, 1944.

Lt. Col. Luther Remi Moore, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 27, 1944.

To be captains

First Lt. Percy Hall Sutley, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 6, 1943.

First Lt. Otto Albert Wurl, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 10, 1944.

First Lt. Raymond Lancing Pendleton, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 28, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Thomas Floyd Davis, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 4, 1944.

Lt. Col. John Nelson White, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 7, 1944.

Lt. Col. William Ferdinand Scheumann, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 7, 1944.

Lt. Col. Campbell Hopson Glascock, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 7, 1944.

Lt. Col. William Frederic Wieck, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 7, 1944.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. George Henry Wilson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 18, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

First Lt. Ernest William Bye, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 18, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

First Lt. John Valdo Painter, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 18, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Frank Pearson MacKenzie, United States Army, with rank from February 28, 1944.

To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) James Joseph McMahon, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from January 17, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Harold Francis Donovan, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from February 3, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 24), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

John Campbell White, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Glenn F. Frost, Henderson.

IOWA

Stanley G. Douglas, Alden.

Mary Conway, Cylinder.

Emil H. Engel, Dixon.

Georgetta B. Dolezal, Elberon.

Albert C. Oetzmann, Eldridge.

William Molloy, Galva.

Ray A. Fox, Hampton.

Mabel I. Olson, Hanlontown.

Lucille M. Wright, Linden.

Frank L. Ratliff, Lynnville.

Marshall D. Thomson, Oakville.

Jessie W. Hart, Webb.

MAINE

Myrtle S. Hardy, Freedom.

NEVADA

William Harold Morgan, Yerington.

NEW YORK

DeVerne A. Lewis, Canastota.

Thomas M. Townsend, Carmel.

Anson A. La Roue, Harrisville.

Mary A. Jerman, Houghton.

Frances D. McClenon, Jamesville.

Joseph L. McKernan, Lake Ronkonkoma.

William J. Devitt, Montgomery.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read:

JANUARY 28, 1944.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of the morning and Father of the night, we praise Thee for Thy kingly salutation which comes ringing down the ages like a melody from other spheres. It has ravished the hearts and strengthened the souls of men and lifted them above the dungeon and the rack. In the present dimness of human history, we pray that America with her wealth, pride, and splendor may make them a complete remedy for the monster cruelties in the breast of this world. How difficult, O God, but Thou dost direct us to love the unloving and to know that life is good by doing good.

Many things are transient and are passing away, yet there is a blossoming in the wilderness untouched and unsmitten by the iniquities of men. By faith and by hope enable us to hold fast to Thee, devoutly waiting for Thy disclosures. Bestow upon us Thine invincible patience and give us a strong, active wisdom in our ministrations. May we be gathered together in unity, in desire, and in common labor for the honor of our great name. Grant that we may not permit pagan savagery to work havoc with our self-control and magnanimity; may we never be paralyzed by disorder or impoverished by lack of confidence and allow no time or strength to be wasted. Help us to approach all problems with thought and quietness and Thine shall be the glory. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

JAPANESE ATROCITIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.* Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Army and Navy Departments have lifted the ban on the story of the atrocities by Japan committed on our American and Filipino prisoners so the world knows what Japan has done in its barbaric treatment of our prisoners. No civilized nation would do this. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Japan as a nation should be annihilated and should not be allowed to function as a nation again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter dated January 24, 1944, signed by John H. Fay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

AIR MAIL FROM OUR SOLDIERS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion lately about the time required to get ballots to and from the soldiers. In this morning's mail I received an air-mail letter from a soldier who is now serving in China. Of course, I do not know where in China he is located, but I do know that a short time ago he was in India.

This letter is postmarked "United States Army Postal Service, A. P. O. 627, January 18, 1944." It took 10 days for it to come from his location in China to my office in Washington, D. C.

In case any of you would like to check on where this soldier is serving, his name is Corp. Ben W. Morse. His number is 37494896, Twenty-fifth AACS, A. P. O. 627, care Postmaster, New York, and I shall be pleased to have anyone interested examine this letter at any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

JAPANESE ATROCITIES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, at midnight last night a commentator at Station WINX called me to the telephone and asked that I listen to the radio broadcast of a report made by the Army and Navy of the United States with respect to the maltreatment of our prisoners in the Philippine Islands. To my mind that conduct of the militarists of Japan ought to reach the pulse and the feeling of resentment of every American.

That story ought to be told in every hamlet, and it ought to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and distributed widely throughout this country. In my judgment, there is nothing in recorded history, not even in the Dark Ages, that will even imitate the atrocious conduct of this mob of savages with which we are engaged in war. I favor the mobilization of every possible unit of the fleets we have and the immediate starting of a movement toward an assault upon Tokyo; and at the end of it, let it be understood that it is blown out of existence.

GOVERNOR EARL WARREN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from Time Magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Walter Lippmann about the Bolivian matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT OF RETURNING SOLDIERS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, ac-

cording to a news item in the January 27 Washington Evening Star, has told the President of a blueprint which he has drawn up for a public-works program for employing returning soldiers. Is this—politically made work—to be the reward for the sacrifices our soldiers are making? Are our soldiers to be disillusioned by learning that while they were away from their country, fighting and dying to save it, that their opportunity for free employment was destroyed?

Is this not slave labor which Mr. Ickes is promising to our returning soldiers? Can it be imagined that men whose free employment has been destroyed by the curse of politics and who have been forced thereby to accept employment such as Mr. Ickes suggests are anything but slaves of the State? I declare this is not what our soldiers are fighting for. They are entitled to something better than this when they return to their homeland. They are entitled to be free-men and to have free employment where they can enjoy the fruits of their own labor and not be regimented into a labor army by the state.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Crisfield (Md.) Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

JAP ATROCITIES

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the atrocities announced last night in a joint statement from our War and Navy Departments perpetuated by the Japanese against American and Filipino soldiers will arouse the American people as they have never been aroused before.

I am cutting the story out of the Washington Post of this morning and will have it placed on the walls of my office. Anyone who tries to talk to me about negotiated peace or peace now, will be requested to read that story. Extracts from this authenticated account of Jap brutalities should make an excellent reply to those on the home front who feel that they are suffering undue hardships.

I am at a loss for adequate words to express my true feelings toward those

who subjected 12,000 Americans and Filipinos to such brutality. Our answer must be a renewed and greater effort to bring about complete annihilation of the Japanese Empire. We on the home front can make answer in part by buying at least one more War bond this week than we thought we were going to be able to buy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein resolutions adopted by the Warren F. Hoyle Post, No. 82, of the American Legion, in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by and a letter from Mr. L. F. Reid, publisher of the Renville Star Farmer, of Renville, Minn., having to do with the poll tax and the ballot.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some resolutions passed by the Republican conference with reference to the death of Mr. Ditter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the St. Louis County Bankers' Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Baltimore Catholic Review, and further to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Baltimore Morning Sun on the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial, and in the other to include a brief Associated Press article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in time of national emergency such as we are now going through, the American people turn to their Congress for leadership and for guidance more than is the case in normal times. They look to us for intelligent, calm advice, free from passion and prejudice. We have the heavy responsibility of weighing tremendous issues, issues which will certainly affect the lives of not only the Americans of this generation, but those of generations yet to come.

In this time of crisis it is up to us to set the example for others in justice, in fair play, and in encouraging a national rather than a sectional point of view. What must the American people think when they read that our President has been denounced and his family unjustly mocked on the floor of this House? What must they think about our American ideals when we devote time here for discussion of things which only serve to create additional disunity; such things as religious differences, racial differences, economic differences? These things should be minimized at all times in a democratic society; in time of war they must be. I sincerely hope, and I know that the great majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle join with me in hoping that in the future we can keep such petty and personal prejudices out of our discussion here, and devote our undivided attention to the tremendous issues that are facing us.

SOLDIER-VOTE BILL

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the President, in his letter to Congress, took a great deal of pleasure in pointing out that Public Law 712 of the Seventy-seventh Congress did not stimulate soldier voting, and that only about 28,000 of them took advantage of that particular law. I should like to

quote briefly from a dispatch which appeared in the New York Times of September 8, 1942, as follows:

STIMSON FOR LIMITING OF SOLDIER-VOTE BILL—AGAINST APPLICATION ABROAD AS MILITARY IMPEDIMENT

WASHINGTON, September 7.—Secretary Stimson, in a letter to Representative HOBBS, asked today that the soldiers' and sailors' absentee voting bill, now pending, be made to apply to only the forces in the United States and Alaska.

Mr. Stimson said the War Department approved in principle the granting of a vote to every soldier and sailor, but he contended that the shipment of ballots and the handling of voting among units overseas would "impede military functions" and might provide a means for the enemy to gather vital secret information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That was in reference to the bill that was passed by this Congress prior to the 1942 election?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. WEISS rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege. Also, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of personal privilege. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RANKIN. What is the request?

Mr. WEISS. It is an editorial from the Times-Herald in regard to a sports hall of fame.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request that the gentleman revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of personal privilege.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in an Associated Press report yesterday or the day before the following article:

Representative SAMUEL A. WEISS (Democrat), of Pennsylvania, declared last night: "If the (Washington) grand jury that indicted 30 for traitorous acts recently had gone another step they would have indicted three Members of Congress." Representative Weiss did not identify the Congressmen.

In an address before the Temple Men's Club, Weiss termed "blobs fighting for selfish ends" within Congress as constituting the biggest obstacle to prosecution of the war, and added, "certain blobs in Congress are a hotbed of fascism."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Gathings	Magnuson
Baldwin, Md.	Gavin	Mansfield, Mont.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Marcantonio
Barry	Gifford	Merritt
Bates, Mass.	Gillette	Morrison, La.
Bell	Gillie	Morrison, N. C.
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Murphy
Bolton	Green	Murray, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Hall	Myers
Bradley, Pa.	Leonard W.	Norton
Brooks	Halleck	O'Leary
Brumbaugh	Harness, Ind.	O'Toole
Buckley	Hébert	Peterson, Ga.
Burchill, N. Y.	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Busbey	Hess	Philbin
Byrne	Hobbs	Poulson
Canfield	Hoch	Pracht
Capozzoli	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Carlson, Kans.	Hope	Rees, Kans.
Celler	Horan	Rockwell
Chapman	Jackson	Satterfield
Cole, N. Y.	Jeffrey	Scanlon
Cullen	Jennings	Scott
Cunningham	Johnson, Ward	Scrivner
Curley	Jones	Sheridan
Dawson	Jonkman	Simpson, Pa.
Dewey	Kee	Slaughter
Dickstein	Kelley	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Kennedy	Treadway
Domengeaux	Keogh	Troutman
Douglas	Kirwan	Vursell
Durham	Kleberg	Wasielewski
Elliott	Klein	Wene
Engle, Calif.	Knutson	West
Fay	Lambertson	Whelchel, Ga.
Feighan	Lane	White
Fellows	Luce	Wilson
Fernandez	Ludlow	Winter
Folger	Lynch	Wolcott
Ford	McGehee	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gallagher	McLean	
Gamble	Maas	
	Madden	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 302 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). The Chair has read the news item referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weiss]. The Chair feels it raises a matter of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I was not responsible for this quorum call. I was satisfied to speak to the group who were assembled here.

I have been charged by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] with statements purported to have been made by me in an address in Cleveland, Ohio, that appeared in certain newspapers. The charges made by my colleague are serious ones, and they directly affect my integrity and that of this legislative body.

Mr. RANKIN. Just a minute; I did not charge the gentleman with anything. I asked him if he made those statements. I did not charge him with making them. I asked him if he did make them.

Mr. WEISS. The gentleman heard my reply on the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but I did not charge the gentleman with making them; I asked if he made those statements.

Mr. WEISS. The gentleman heard my reply yesterday on the floor, and I pleaded with you to permit me to reply and you refused.

I delivered an extemporaneous speech. My subject was, Congress—the War and Peace. I began with the lend-lease bill, the repeal of the Neutrality Act, the extension of the Selective Service Act, and so forth. Not wishing to rely on my memory alone in dealing with the laws referred to I had the Library of Congress prepare a digest of the laws passed or considered since I came to this Congress. I referred to prepared notes and am willing to submit them to any Member of the House to read. There were some 20 cards of notes with factual data referring in detail to every vote on major bills and votes on appropriations giving exact amounts which I discussed at this forum.

Let us analyze the article referred to by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that appeared in the newspaper. I am quoted as stating:

Labels Congress the worst obstacle to the successful prosecution of the war.

This statement I deny I ever made in my discussion at Cleveland. I did, however, state this:

Subsidies are one of the most vital issues now confronting the Congress affecting the living conditions of 130,000,000 American people; that soon the extension of credit to C. C. C. will expire and Congress has taken no action because a powerful farm bloc is bitterly opposed to subsidies; that I maintained that if subsidies are banned, prices will skyrocket within a period of 6 months. There will be thousands of demands from labor groups for wage increases and I would support them. With wages chasing prices, inflation, a deadly enemy of our economy, will be upon us. Further, I maintained a ban on subsidies will do more to hinder the successful prosecution of the war than any other undertaking by the Congress.

During the course of the forum in answer to a query I informed my audience that contrary to the beliefs and statements of the dictators that democracy was decadent and unable to function in an emergency; I informed them that Congress within an hour voted a declaration of war with Japan with only one opposing vote; that we likewise voted similar resolution against Germany and Italy without any objection or opposition. Congress, rising to the same degree of non-partisanship and statesmanship, authorized appropriations totaling \$295,152,690,661.22 up to the end of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress to aid in the successful prosecution of the war.

The newspaper further quoted me as stating:

If the Washington grand jury that indicted 30 for traitorous acts recently had gone another step they would have indicted three Members of the Congress.

The above statement was never made by me or anyone in my behalf, nor did I ever authorize anyone to make such a dastardly statement.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Associated Press reporter admitted to me that they had no one present at the meeting—they got the information from another newspaper report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WEISS. I would rather complete my statement, but will be glad to yield later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is speaking on a question of personal privilege, answering certain statements made in the press, and defending his position. The Chair thinks that thus far the gentleman has complied with the rules.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. WEISS. There is a further quotation in the newspaper report:

Certain blocs in Congress are a hotbed for fascism.

I vehemently deny making that statement. It was not made by me in my Cleveland address nor was it ever made by me at any place or at any time.

I want to read here some telegrams sent me by some of the finest citizens of Cleveland:

You were quoted as saying that Congress was a hotbed of Fascists and that three Members of Congress should be indicted by the grand jury. I attended this meeting of the Men's Club and know that this statement is untrue.

L. C. HAAS,
Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

I was present at the meeting of the Temple Men's Club on January 25 and did not hear you make any statement that Congress was a hotbed of fascism or that three Members of Congress should be indicted.

HERMAN S. MESHORER.

I heard tonight you accused of saying at meeting of the Men's Club here Tuesday that Congress was a hotbed of fascism and that the grand jury should indict several Members. I was present during your talk and certainly don't recall you saying those things.

JOE HARTZMARK.

Listened to your address at Men's Club meeting Tuesday evening. Did not hear you make reported statements that Congress was hotbed of fascism.

LESTER COLBERT.

I have many other telegrams here from prominent men who were present and heard me and they all say that no such statement or inference was made which would lead the membership to believe that SAM WEISS had said that Congress was a hotbed of fascism.

As I stated on this floor yesterday, any individual who would make a statement of that nature is certainly not worthy of the trust placed in him, nor would he be worthy of the privilege of sitting in these Halls of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. When I complete my statement I shall be glad to yield.

I am pleased to state that these colleagues of mine who know me best say they have never heard me use the word "fascism" in debate, in forum discussion, or in any of my remarks or speeches. I have never make such a reference. The

word itself, while an obsession with some people, is not an expression of mine.

The meeting in Cleveland was an open forum, and during the discussion my opinion was asked concerning Congresswoman BOLTON and also Congressman FEIGHAN. I had nothing but highest praise for both Representatives. Later, in informal discussion, I also commented on the excellent representation given Ohio by Congressmen ROWE, BENDER, and CROSSER. I informed the group that Congressman ROWE's brother was a United Mine Worker, and that Congressman ROWE, together with Congressman BENDER, were real friends of the workers.

May I say to my colleague—very humbly—that I have been in public life for over 10 years. My first venture into public service was as a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature. I was the first person of my faith ever elected to that office from my district; also, I am the first person of my faith ever to be elected to the Congress of the United States from this same district. My constituency of some 350,000 people, with less than 5,000 of my faith, is an understanding and American-spirited group of people. I am proud of my heritage and they know it. They also know of my athletic background and that, as a football official, my integrity at the high schools, colleges, and in the cities throughout this Nation where I have officiated has never been questioned. And I do not propose to change my course of living at this late stage of the game.

I am an immigrant lad, but I love my country just as dearly as does the gentleman from Mississippi. I am a Jew and proud of my heritage, but nothing transcends my love for my country, the country that guarantees to all of us freedom of religion, to worship as we desire to meet the needs of our souls, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech. No individual or group in this country, including the gentleman from Mississippi, has any priorities on America or its priceless freedom. All of us trace our heritage to some foreign source, including the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I will yield later, gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. Why does the gentleman continue to raise the race question?

Mr. WEISS. I will be happy to yield later.

The pioneers of this land, the Pilgrims, Puritans, Huguenots, the Catholics, and the Jews, driven from their homes in foreign lands because of intolerance and persecution, built on these shores a shrine of liberty—which is now being threatened by the forces of dictatorship.

Day in and day out we hear Members of Congress and the press of the country clamor for national unity—our only hope for preserving the freedoms we enjoy. These freedoms and the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution in the Bill of Rights are threatened today by enemies from within who are just as dangerous as any of those from without. Those Americans within our gates who

are spreading falsehoods and arousing suspicion against racial and religious groups in the hope of dividing our Nation into hostile groups, are playing the game with Hitler and his Axis partners. They seek to create confusion and panic so that America may be impotent in the event of attack from without. Like the fifth columnists, this is a new weapon of modern warfare. Freedom is our heritage. To defend freedom is our duty.

Certainly there is no one in this Congress opposed to the free expression of any of its Members on any vital issues affecting the country—even if one must at times criticize a fellow colleague of the House.

I cherish the friendships made in the House and I shall always respect the opinion of my colleagues even though I may disagree with it. To repeat the words of Voltaire, "I do not agree with a word that you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

I feel certain this includes the right to fair criticism with supporting factual data in order to aid in crystallizing honest public opinion among the American people.

While all America cries for national unity, I urge the gentleman from Mississippi to memorize and heed the following pledge adopted by the Catholics, Protestants, and Jews at the National Conference of Christians and Jews in New York City in 1938:

Beneath the torch of liberty,
We pledge as one, although we're three,
To keep from this democracy
Intolerance and bigotry.

MR. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. WEISS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

MR. EBERHARTER. It had not been my intention to say anything on this occasion, but I have known my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] for a great number of years. I come from the same county in Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] became generally well known when he was a student at Duquesne University, in Pittsburgh, Pa. He became known as one of the star athletes of that university. Although slight of stature, as you can all see, very light in weight, he nevertheless played so hard, so fast, and so clean that he was recognized not only in western Pennsylvania but all over the country as a fair, clean sportsman.

After he graduated from school he practiced law, and before the courts of Pennsylvania in representing his clients and in his representation to the courts he established a reputation as good as any reputation that has ever been established in the courts of Allegheny County, Pa. From there he went into political life, and, as he said so well, in a district where there are very few people of his faith, he was so well known and made such a reputation that he carried that district by an overwhelming majority, and it is recognized now that there is nobody who can defeat him because of the reputation he has established as being fair, square, tolerant, and a decent American citizen.

For several years he has been called upon to officiate as a referee and as an umpire in football games all over the United States. Why? Because he has that inherent fairness and squareness and honesty, intellectually and otherwise, that is necessary in a person officiating not only in college games but in professional games.

MR. SPEAKER. Fairness and squareness are matters of habit, and this gentleman has demonstrated all of his life that he has that instinctive habit of fair play. I know that he had no intention whatsoever at any time of saying anything of a disparaging nature against any Member of Congress. I have seen him very closely since he has come to the Congress, Mr. Speaker, and I have often said: "There is one thing about SAM WEISS, and that is he never says anything derogatory about any Member of Congress or any other person, whether it be his political opponent or any other person with whose views he does not agree." He has that reputation with every person and every group that knows him.

MR. SPEAKER. This gentleman has been and is being subjected to an indignity by the very repetition on the floor of this House of that item that appeared in the newspaper. He has suffered injury. I know every Member of this House is fair and wants to be fair. I hope and I am sure that after his explanation his word will be believed. It is only my hope that in the permanent RECORD there will be expunged everything that has been said in connection with this regrettable incident.

MR. WEISS. I thank the gentleman. I am indeed grateful to him.

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. WEISS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

MR. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has answered the question I asked him on yesterday. I explained to him then that I had no desire to do him any injustice. I agree with him that anybody who would go out and make the statements attributed to him ought to be expelled from Congress. I asked the gentleman if he made the statement that "certain blocs in Congress are a hotbed of fascism." He said he did not make that statement.

MR. WEISS. That is right.

MR. RANKIN. I said to him yesterday that if he did not make those statements, what I wanted him to do was to let the House know it, because it was published in an Associated Press article on the day before yesterday. As I said, I have no desire whatever to do the gentleman from Pennsylvania any injustice.

MR. WEISS. If the gentleman had let me make my statement yesterday, we would not have gone into all that tirade on the floor that occurred and my statement today would not have been necessary.

MR. RANKIN. I was not the only one engaged in that debate.

MR. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. WEISS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

MR. WRIGHT. I should not like to let this occasion pass without joining with my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] in testifying before this House to my admiration for the integrity, honor, and truthfulness of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just spoken. SAMMY WEISS is known throughout western Pennsylvania as an athlete, a lawyer, a sportsman, a legislator, and as a person who is interested in charities not only of his own faith but those of the Catholic and Protestant religions also. SAMMY WEISS is recognized throughout western Pennsylvania as a square shooter. He enjoys the respect of all the people in that district. I feel as confident that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says on this floor today is true as if I had been at the meeting in which his speech was misrepresented and had heard his remarks myself.

MR. WEISS. I am grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

MR. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. WEISS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

MR. KUNKEL. About 2 weeks ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania made a speech in Harrisburg, Pa. The first thing I knew about his having made that speech was when I began to receive highly pleasant letters telling me first, what a fine speech he had made and secondly, what complimentary remarks the gentleman had made at the two meetings which he addressed about me and about my service in Congress.

I should like to read to you from one of these letters to give an illustration of the reaction that occurred in Harrisburg. This letter was written by Eugene E. Miller, who is also a professional football referee. He was a great athlete at Penn State and a famous college referee also. He was formerly county comptroller of Dauphin County, leading the ticket when the returns were counted. He has taught in the public schools in that county for a great many years, and has the respect of parents and students alike. Today he is principal of the Edison Junior High School. This is a personal letter. If it were not, I should put the whole letter in the RECORD. He writes me as follows:

Now, I'd like to say a word about SAMMY WEISS, whom I like very much. He did a grand job up here on January 11 at the American Legion dinner honoring our senior high-school football squads, and I wish you'd tell him when you speak with him that quite a number of fellows spoke to me about his fine message. There was no doubt about his attitude toward you in speaking to the people of your community, for he not only said you were a distinct credit to us, but he also told all of the gathering that there was no doubt about your importance in your particular activities in the Congress.

I may add that I have received a number of other letters, which time will not permit me to read, all of which are along the same line. When I was back in Harrisburg after his speech a number of people told me the same thing. While I was not present in Cleveland and cannot testify as to that speech, yet it seems to me that this reaction in Harrisburg has an evidential value in respect to the type of

speech the gentleman from Pennsylvania makes. I welcome the opportunity of making this statement in behalf of my good friend.

Mr. WEISS. I am indeed grateful to the gentleman.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield to my athletic colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I have known the gentleman from Pennsylvania, SAM WEISS, for a period of about 1 year personally, but I have known him many years by reputation. He has much better sense than you ascribe to him, when you think he could possibly make any such remarks. He has never spoken in my presence on the floor of the House or off the floor of the House in any disparaging way about any of his colleagues, to my knowledge. I think it is a dirty shame that the gentleman has to stand before this gathering and suffer from any such intimation.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. This is a shining example, Mr. Speaker, of a tempest in a teapot. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] needs no defense from anyone. I saw a shining example of his fairness yesterday when he presided as chairman over a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. He is a valiant soul and a valiant friend. He needs no defense from anyone. He is a valued Member of this body.

Mr. WEISS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I want all of you to know that while I may disagree with you at times, the day I start going into other districts speaking in derogatory terms against any Member of this House, it is then time that I should be unseated myself.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I read from the newspaper Daily Worker:

The best seller Sabotage, by Albert E. Kahn and Michael Sayers, says of this notorious speech by HOFFMAN:

"He (HOFFMAN) ordered 145,000 reprints of this Roosevelt Is a Judas speech, and 105,000 franked envelopes to circulate it throughout the country. The chief distributor of HOFFMAN's scurrilous tirade was Charles B. Hudson, the subversive propagandist of Omaha, Nebr. Hudson, who was subsequently indicted by the Department of Justice on charges of conspiracy to provoke revolt and disloyalty within the United States armed forces, mailed out thousands of reprints of HOFFMAN's speech in the Congressman's franked envelopes."

I read further:

HOFFMAN had the gall to declare on the floor of Congress—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair feels that the gentleman has stated

a question of personal privilege. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one need be disturbed about the length of time I shall take. Ten or fifteen minutes will be ample, and that time would not be taken by me were it not for some things that were said heretofore by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS], who preceded me. I have had no part whatever in this incident which came up yesterday, which has been referred to today, but some good may come out of that incident. It is my hope that it will bring home to every Member of the House the fact that there is altogether too much irresponsible reporting. Just why the American press, which until recent years has always been considered, especially the great news services, as being accurate and fair, should continue to repeat false charges is beyond me. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] was quoted in the press as having made certain statements. So far as I am concerned, and I think so far as the other Members of the House are concerned, when he rose on the floor of the House and said that he did not make that statement, that was and should have been sufficient for all of us.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. Just to make this observation, that the gentleman must appreciate the fact that the American press, so far as reporting is concerned, is just as seriously affected, so far as men gathering news is concerned, by the war as is any other industry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No doubt about that. Ordinarily the reporters are accurate. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress attention was called by me to the fact that the C. I. O. organization referred to a banquet they held downtown, at which certain Members of Congress were present, and made the statement—and it was published in the newspapers—that Members of Congress had received a sum—I do not recall whether \$3,000 or \$5,000—for voting one way or the other—I have forgotten which way—on the Rumml plan. That statement, within a few days, I think the next day, was called to the attention of the House by me. I requested that we take some action. No action was taken. Subsequently the statement was repeated as having come from one Congressman who was present at that meeting. My point is this: When statements like that are made, especially here in the Washington press, reflecting upon the honesty and the integrity of the people's Representatives, and the men who make them are available, as those men were at that time, they should be called before a committee of this Congress and required, to use a colloquial expression, to put up or shut up. They should be made to give evidence to prove their charge if they can, and if they cannot, then they should be branded as prevaricators. If the false statements are willfully and knowingly made, the makers should be denied the privileges of the House Press Gallery.

So far as the statement with reference to the speech I made, it has been published time and time again, throughout

the country. It is said that I made a speech in which I said that the President was a Judas. I never made any such speech.

I did make a speech on the 27th of January 1942, and again on the 30th day of January 1942, in both of which I protested as vehemently as I knew how against the betrayal of this country to an international organization, and I mentioned several persons, one a member of the President's Cabinet and one a member of the United States Supreme Court, whose names were on that literature as being willing to do away with the Constitution of the United States, to do away with the flag of the country and substitute an international constitution and an international flag to take the place of the Stars and Stripes, and I stand on that speech. Not 145,000 copies, but 165,000 copies of the combined and condensed speeches were printed, and I had requests for over 300,000. I say once more that I think it will sometime be a good thing to reprint that speech, just as soon as the war is over and possibly, perhaps, before it is over, so that we can think of our own men, our own country, so that we can get our minds on the war once more.

With Stalin refusing our offer to mediate on the Poland dispute, telling us he will settle that issue himself, with H. G. Wells, of England, writing, as he is reported to have written, saying the three countries have no right to attempt to govern the world, the advocates of union now might well devote their efforts to the winning of the war.

There is a story today in the morning paper about what the Japs have done, are doing to our prisoners of war, and I understand there will be a detailed account in that same newspaper, known as the Chicago Tribune, which seems to have had a monopoly on the original story which has so long been kept from the people by the administration. I hope that every one will read the stories of these atrocities in the Chicago Tribune, and for once we will begin to have the war in mind as the first thing to which we should give attention.

When our minority leader, Mr. Snell, was here, a question arose about the use of the frank.

On November 19, 1937, a letter was written to the then Solicitor of the Post Office Department, Karl A. Crowley, by the then minority leader of the House, Bert Snell. That letter is as follows:

DEAR MR. CROWLEY: Will you please give me a ruling on the following: Is it legal for a Member of Congress to frank communications, either typewritten or mimeographed, dealing solely with the public business?

In reply, the following was written under date of November 23, 1937:

The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 19, requesting to be advised whether it is legal for a Member of Congress to frank communications, either typewritten or mimeographed, dealing solely with the public business.

It is provided by 39 United States Code 327 that: "The Vice President, Members and Members-elect of, Delegates and Delegates-elect to Congress, and the Resident Commissioners from Puerto Rico and the Philippines, shall have the privilege of sending free through the mails, and under their frank,

any mail matter to any Government official or to any person, correspondence, not exceeding 4 ounces in weight, upon official or departmental business (until the 1st day of December following the expiration of their respective terms of office)."

Your inquiry is accordingly answered in the affirmative.

I later wrote the Office of the Solicitor of the Post Office Department in the following letter:

On page 18519 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1940, I extended my remarks by including an article on the March of Democracy.

If I have copies of these remarks printed by other than the Government Printer and in different type, may I still send them out under my franking privilege?

On the 25th following, my letter was answered in these words:

In answer to your letter of September 21, which the Solicitor has referred to this office, you are advised that the act of Congress of March 3, 1875, embodied in section 609, Postal Laws and Regulations, provides as follows:

"The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or any part thereof, or speeches or reports therein contained, shall, under the frank of a Member of Congress or Delegate, * * * be carried in the mail free of postage."

The place of printing of extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or the style of type used does not affect their frankability. In this connection, I may say that when it is desired to send under frank extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the extracts should, in order that their character may be apparent on the face, bear such identifying indicia as will clearly show that they are from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I say further that not one of the speeches ever made by me was franked out in violation of the law, and Mr. Hudson—and I hope this is the last time I shall be called on to answer that charge—never had my frank for any purpose. That ought to be sufficient. I yield back the remainder of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I am to make this afternoon and include certain extracts and statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF INSURANCE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 422), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3270) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for

amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLEY], former secretary of state of Delaware, may have the privilege of revising and extending his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the 1943 soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in committee today, and to include certain excerpts from newspapers and periodicals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting an address made by Dr. McGowan, in Washington on January 15; also to revise and extend my remarks by placing in the RECORD two articles appearing in the Philadelphia Record in reference to the difficulty of making out the income-tax return.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and include resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill shall continue for 3 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia that general debate on the bill shall continue for 3 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4070, the inde-

pendent offices appropriation bill, 1945, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the Polish-Russian boundary is one of universal interest not only in the United States but throughout the democratic world. The interest is not confined exclusively to Americans of Polish antecedents, nor to any other element of the American people, and discussions are not always free of biased sentiment. I should perhaps say prejudice, or more appropriately, that expressions are frequently made which are predicated upon ignorance and upon a definitely unjustified and anti-Polish viewpoint.

To the uninformed the unfounded, intemperate, and ill-timed expressions of the Russian newspaper Pravda, which is the official organ of the Communist Party and reckoned as the mouthpiece of the Soviet Government, and the caustic and unfriendly expressions of War and the Working Classes, to say nothing of Izvestia, which is the official organ of the Russian Government, might impress many of our people with the justice of the spurious claims of our "converted Russian ally."

In this country it appears that on occasion some individual with the aid of unfriendly press support will undertake to speak with authority, not only for the Americans of Polish antecedents but also for the Polish citizens residing in the homeland, and these expressions so ably press-agented are frequently anti-Polish if not downright pro-Russian and the origin in such instances is apt to be doubtful and certainly not representative of the sentiments of the great mass of Americans of Polish antecedents in the United States, or of the Government in exile, or the people which it represents living in Poland.

I want to read into the RECORD a statement signed by 17 eminent and patriotic Polish educators, each one identified with some outstanding institution of learning. These men are among the foremost in their respective fields, they are of unimpeachable character, and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that they, if anyone, speak the sentiments of the great bulk of the people of Polish antecedents in this country. While I do not presume to state with authority, I shall say nevertheless that I believe these men, knowing Poland and the Polish people, reflect, too, the overwhelmingly popular opinion of the Poles in the fatherland.

It is plain and evident that this statement is intended to combat and to put in its proper place the erroneous pro-Russian views of Dr. Oscar Lange whom a fractional though vociferous minority seeks to foist on the American public as an authority and as one who reflects the trend in opinion among Americans of Polish antecedents.

I should like to add for the benefit of the Members of the House that Dr. Lange speaks only for himself and to be as charitable as possible toward him,

I should say he speaks with poor taste and with ingratitude whenever he presumes that Americans of Polish ancestry, or the people of Poland, in order to placate Russia, are willing to sacrifice their own bloodstained territory. Certainly the sentiment is well-nigh universal that Poland desires to live in closest friendship and as a good neighbor to Russia but not at a price, not at the expense of jeopardizing her own independence.

The determination of the form of government which the Polish people will eventually choose is something which the Poles insist is their own and exclusive privilege and responsibility. They will not jeopardize the religious life and the freedom of the people because to do so would mean bowing to communism and the permanent establishment of a puppet form of Soviet Government.

The Poles look to the world for support of their attitude in the hope that they may preserve their independence, freedom of conscience, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience.

The Polish Government made clear its position and its attitude has been most generous, exemplary in its patience, when it was stated that the boundary question can be solved by mutual consent but cannot be determined on a unilateral basis or imposed by Russia as a conqueror.

The statement to which I referred was prepared by Dr. Jerzy Kaulbersz, of the college of medicine at the Wayne University of Detroit, Mich., and I commend it to the membership for your most earnest consideration.

The statement reads as follows:

The American press reported recently of a new Polish organization, the Kosciuszko League, founded in Detroit with the purpose of spreading among the Polish population the idea of an acquiescent attitude toward Soviet Russia. One of two principal speakers at the organizational meeting was Dr. Oscar Lange, professor of political economy at the University of Chicago.

Dr. Oscar Lange emerged as an ardent follower of Russian claims to eastern Poland on April 29, 1943 (a few days after the rupture by the Soviets of diplomatic relations with Poland), publishing a provocative letter in the New York Herald Tribune, in which Poland's determination to maintain the integrity of her territory was called by him "national hysteria." His suggestions were identical with propositions from the Russian foreign office.

Dr. Lange's opinion is being given widest publicity as that of a Polish scholar and a former member of Krakow University, thus creating a false impression that he reflects the opinion of the Polish scholars. Therefore we, professors and lecturers of the Polish universities, declare that we take most vigorous exception to both his views and his tactics. It is an easy but by no means convincing method simply to accuse people holding other opinions of being Fascists and reactionaries, in order to discredit them in public opinion. But we expected a more impartial and scholarly approach on the part of Dr. Lange who as a lecturer had been associated for a short time with Krakow University. This university had always represented the highest Polish spiritual values, and in the present war nearly all of its members had been deported to the Nazi concentration camps, where many died in consequence of

inhuman treatment. We also expected more fairness on Professor Lange's part in dealing with the government of an Allied nation of which he was a citizen until a short time ago.

We all are in favor of cooperation between an independent and democratic Poland and the Soviet Union, and we think that Poland gave ample proof of this being her desire. But to achieve such a cooperation the territorial claims of Soviet Russia must be withdrawn. The Polish-Russian frontier of 1921 had been a frontier of compromise, and as such it had never been questioned by Russia. The Poles are the most numerous there, and except for the time of partitions, these territories belonged to Poland for many centuries not only historically but yet culturally. Large cities in this territory, Lwow (which had never belonged to Russia) and Wilno, are inhabited by an overwhelming majority of pure Poles, and are among the main centers of Polish culture. Many great leaders in Poland's history, and a number of great poets came from eastern Poland.

Poland was first to fight against Nazi domination and has continued this struggle ever since with appalling sacrifices on the home front and abroad. Russia, it should be remembered, joined the United Nations only after being attacked by Germany and after 22 months of collaboration with the Nazis. It would be a great injustice and in discord with international morality, should Poland be deprived of any part of her territory in favor of Russia. Political, historical, and cultural reasons speak against it as strongly as the moral principles for which we are fighting this war.

Dr. Henryk Arctowski, Lwow University, Observatory of the Smithsonian Institution; Dr. Gustaw Bychowski, Warsaw University; Dr. Wladyslaw Gorczynski, director, Central Meteorological Institute, Warsaw; Dr. Oscar Halecki, Warsaw University; Dr. Jerzy Kaulbersz, Krakow University, Wayne University; Dr. Andrzej Krzesinski, Krakow University, University of Montreal; Mr. Michal Laskowski, Warsaw Agricultural College, University of Arkansas; Dr. Gustaw A. Mokrzycki, Warsaw Institute of Technology, University of Montreal; Dr. Stanislaw Mrozowski, Warsaw University, Chicago University; Dr. Józef Pawlikowski, Warsaw Institute of Technology, Ecole Polytechnique de Montreal; Dr. Jan H. Rosen, Lwow Institute of Technology, Catholic University of America; Dr. Stanislaw Sniesko, Krakow University, University of Maine; Dr. Wojciech Swietoslowski, Warsaw Institute of Technology, Mellon Institute for Industrial Research; Dr. Jozef Sulkowski, Poznan University; Dr. Boleslaw Szczeniowski, Warsaw Institute of Technology, Ecole Polytechnique de Montreal; Dr. Aleksander Turyn, Warsaw University; and Dr. Florian Znaniecki, Poznan University, University of Illinois.

As further evidence of the attitude of Americans of Polish antecedents, I want to read to you a resolution which was adopted by the executive council and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, having membership in every State of the Union.

This progressive and patriotic organization, I am sure, reflects the opinion of the great bulk of the Polish Americans and I feel safe in saying that it is not

only the guide but a reflection of the self-same feeling of the liberty-loving people of America.

This organization is representative of Polonia and is the second largest in America.

I invite your attention while I read the following resolution:

CHICAGO, ILL., January 25, 1944.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the plenary meeting of the executive council and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, duly held on the 11th day of January 1944, in Chicago, Ill., all of the national officers being in attendance at said meeting:

"Whereas the American press has published under today's date line a news item from London to the effect that the Government of Soviet Russia has formally announced that it will annex the eastern section of Poland, embracing in area approximately one-half of the territory of Poland; and

"Whereas the Government of Soviet Russia asserts that the Polish Government in exile, now located in London, does not represent the will of the Polish Nation, and further charges the Polish Government with incompetency, because of the alleged failure to organize active resistance to the Nazi invader; and

"Whereas the Government of Soviet Russia forcibly and illegally seizes Polish lands, without the consent of the population residing therein, thus undermining the foundation of the future growth and existence of Poland, and thereby assuming a stand, contrary to all principles of democracy and liberty, for which the present war is being fought; and

"Whereas the charges leveled by the Soviet Government against the present Polish Government are untrue, as the Polish Government in London is the sole and constitutional exponent of the will of the Polish Nation, and said Government has taken all steps possible to combat our common foe; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the executive council and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, convened at its plenary meeting in Chicago, Ill., on January 11, 1944, solemnly protests, in the name of its membership composed of Americans of Polish extraction, against the contemplated partition of Poland by Soviet Russia, and supports the stand taken by the Polish Government in London, which is allied with the Government of the United States.

"We place implicit trust in our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and express the firm conviction that he will not permit the Government of Soviet Russia to despoil the Polish Nation, now so terribly tortured and ravaged by the Nazi barbarians."

JAN J. OLEJNICZAK,

President,

STEPHEN S. GRABOWSKI,

Secretary General,

ANTHONY J. KOZUBAL,

Treasurer,

For the Executive Council and Directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that the proposed second Bill of Rights in the President's message is at once one of the most challenging and most provocative things with which the Congress will have to deal in a long time.

I used the term challenging and provocative because it is a goal which can in whole or in part be achieved and maintained only when government pursues a

sound fiscal policy which will make possible a stable national income which will support not only a security program but make it possible for the industry of the Nation to meet the problems with which it will be confronted in the post-war period.

By way of illustration let me begin with the reminder that there is pending before both branches of Congress a unified social-security program which is contained in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. It will be recalled that this extension of the security program, together with the security benefits which are now available, would be provided through a tax of 6 percent on employers and 6 percent on employees.

In addition there will be other administrative expenditures at both Federal and State levels which will in reality make this something more than a 12-percent tax upon that portion of the national income which comes within the provisions of this tax proposal.

It might be quite obvious that any kind of tax upon employer or employee can be fruitful and productive of revenue only if industry earns profits and only as there are jobs from the wages of which the tax on the employee must be paid. This is another way of saying that there must be a stable as well as a high national income if further security programs are to be carried out and the obligations of Government are required.

But let me pose what I deem to be a very pertinent inquiry. What would happen to the "second bill of rights" as set forth in the President's message to Congress if there were an inadequate number of jobs? What happens to the "second bill of rights" if there is no incentive for industry to attain maximum production of civilian goods when the war is at an end? What happens to the "second bill of rights" if those impelling and very human factors which are at the heart of a free-enterprise system are in any way diminished or destroyed?

As I envision the basic post-war problem which is before us, it addresses itself to two fundamental facts. The first is that we must honorably support the largest debt structure in the history of the Nation. Already it has been intimated in the Budget message to the Congress that at the end of the fiscal year 1945, which to be exact would be June 30, 1945, the national debt is estimated at \$253,000,000,000. It has also been estimated that the interest on the national debt for every 365 days will be at least \$5,000,000,000, and might be more, depending on what the going rate of interest will be at that time.

Manifestly that is an imperative charge in our fiscal program, because failure to pay the interest on outstanding obligations of the Government would constitute not only repudiation of our obligations, but would end in complete economic chaos and disaster. Carrying the national debt, therefore, is the first realistic imperative with which we are confronted, and there can be no dodging of this responsibility.

Secondly, it will require a high national income to support the estimated public debt and the interest charge

thereon. Moreover, it will require a high and stable national income to meet the general obligations of Government as a result of the functions of Government which Congress has legislated from time to time.

These can be met only in the form of taxation and no matter what type of tax is imposed, there must be profits, wages, rewards, and income if those taxes are to prove fruitful. It is but another way of saying that no matter what functions, policies, and programs may be pursued by the Federal Government, they can be continued and maintained only when sufficient revenue is available for that purpose unless we propose to continue on a basis of deficit spending and spend our way into disaster. Federal revenue can only be derived from national income and so it becomes very pertinent to analyze the sources of income upon which we must rely.

In the case of the millions of people who rely upon industry for a livelihood and receive substantial wages for their work, those wages become a source of revenue. When business and industry are operating at a profit, those profits become a source of revenue. There is no other place to go. But jobs are inevitably contingent not only upon the operation of such industry as exists today but upon new industrial enterprises to provide even more jobs than the number which existed in the pre-war period. Our whole hope, therefore, of meeting the impact of the transition from war to peace and of preserving a system of free private enterprise, reposes in the incentives which will make it possible for private enterprise to exist and which serve as an inducement for venture, capital, and adventurous people to go into business and to provide more goods for more people in more places. Industry and business will be energized and stimulated to carry the country to a greater level of prosperity than ever before only in proportion as the incentive of profit and reward and reasonable freedom from burdensome restrictions is preserved.

What, then, are the incentives which not only keep people in business but cause them to venture into business? They must be permitted either as individuals or as corporate entities to retain a sufficient amount of their earnings, to provide working capital, to provide reserves and to provide a profit as a reward for risk and effort. Consider that requirement in the light of our present bewildering and burdensome tax program and policy. In round figures the overall revenue yield of the Federal Government is now about forty-one and one-half billion dollars. In addition thereto another tax bill is pending in Congress which will add another two billion to this total. If this level of taxation is maintained, it means that forty-three and one-half billion dollars will be taken from the national income, exclusive of the amounts which are now taken by States and local subdivisions of government. If the President's recommendations for a tax bill to yield ten and one-half billion dollars were enacted into law, it would mean that Federal revenues would reach the staggering sum of

more than \$51,000,000,000. This, of course, can be achieved only by higher rates and a broader base so that the rewards from thrift, enterprise, and endeavor will be even more sharply reduced. What, then, becomes of the incentive to venture into business? What, then, becomes of the incentive to remain in business if a reward which is wholly disproportionate to the effort, skill, talent, and risk which must be devoted thereto is the only thing which is left?

It is an open secret that so much of our best industrial brains are today taking a riskless position. Men with ingenuity and mental resource who have capacity for directing all manner of enterprise from which comes jobs are today taking riskless positions because of taxation which to them seems quite oppressive. Capital is taking a riskless position today. The various figures from different departments and agencies indicate too plainly that money is moving into a position where the returns for long-time investment are extremely small. It indicates only too well that safety rather than return has become an impelling consideration.

When our best industrial talent and skill is divested of the incentive to assume hazards and burdens which attend industry and enterprise, when capital markets remain stagnant as they have done for so many years, when the expense and the risk of obtaining capital becomes a genuinely hazardous adventure because of the restrictions, liabilities, and responsibilities which are imposed by the various laws now administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission, when government is so niggardly in providing a pat on the back to industry for a job well done in time of war and has no kind word for every effort which it is already making in meeting the shock from war to peace, one may conclude not only that our free-enterprise system is in danger but that the rewards, the jobs, and the wages upon which we must depend in the post-war period to meet our debt and maintain high national income may not be there in sufficient volume to meet our needs. What, then, becomes of a security program unless that program is carried on by means of deficit spending? What, then, becomes of the second Bill of Rights? Eventually there must be a revamping of the tax structure so that incentives for business and more business, for jobs and more jobs, will be retained. Herein lies the greatest assurance for meeting the enormous fiscal problems which are before us.

Let us then examine the origin of our revenue needs. Pending before us at this very moment is the independent offices appropriations which in round figures proposes appropriations of \$8,500,000,000. When these funds are expended they must be offset either by taxes or by borrowings if our fiscal house is to be kept in order. If we must resort to borrowing in order to balance the Federal books those borrowings will be reflected in an increasing national debt. When those funds are expended they will be spent in part for the maintenance of a civil establishment in which there

are nearly 3,000,000 persons on the Federal rolls. In dealing with taxes, national debt, bureaucracy, extravagance, and inefficiency it would be far better if we went back to fundamental causes.

It is nearly a hundred years ago that Henry David Thoreau, the old philosopher who hewed out the great truths in an atmosphere of nature, once observed that for every person who hacks at the roots of evil there are a hundred hacking at the branches. I often wonder whether we have not been hacking at the branches instead of the roots in the many discussions in this Chamber. Expenditures show up in the form of taxes and borrowings, and to diminish the reason for taxes and the reason for borrowings, expenditure must be reduced to an absolute minimum. Here, however, it must be said that every expenditure that is necessary, must be willingly made in the interest of a speedy and complete victory.

The expenditures, however, are but the fruits of functions and activities undertaken by the Federal Government. That is equally true of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy in itself is a result and not a cause. If government did not undertake such a function as is now exercised by the Board of Geographic Names in the Department of the Interior, it is entirely possible that the more than 100 people who are engaged in this activity would not be required and thus both bureaucracy and expenditure would be proportionately reduced. If expenditure were reduced, the need for revenue or the need to borrow would be proportionately diminished. So our examination of this matter must be along fundamental lines and we must examine the activities, functions, and policies of government to determine which are a proper field of Federal activity and which are defensible if we expect to find relief. Perhaps an illustration of this matter is in point.

The bill now before us which makes appropriations for the independent establishments of government makes provision for an agency known as the Securities and Exchange Commission. It was established about 10 years ago and now administers a variety of functions such as the Security Act of 1933, the Trust and Indenture Act of 1939, the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, the supervision of over-the-counter markets, the inspection of brokers and dealers and a variety of other functions. This agency now employs 1,194 people. Of this number 894 are departmental personnel and the balance are in the field. There you have bureaucracy. But what accounts for the 1,194 people who deal with the business of policing brokers, dealers, and exchanges, the registration of stock issues and the other functions which they manage? It was done in pursuance of a number of pieces of legislation enacted by the Congress.

The bare enactment of a law by this body is of no force and effect until it is administered by some agency. Such an agency must be staffed with a variety of personnel and here we see from cause to effect how bureaucracy springs from Federal activities which have been or-

dained by the law-making body of this Government.

The personnel employed by Securities and Exchange Commission must be paid. There must be funds for telephone and telegraph service. There must be funds for supplies and those funds derive only from appropriations made pursuant to law by the Congress. Those appropriations must at sometime or other be offset either by taxes or by borrowings. Here again we have cause and effect.

When Congress ordains a function to be administered by some agency of Government, it has so frequently delegated this authority in broad language which permits the making of rules and regulations to carry such an act into effect. Those rules and regulations have the force and effect of law and there one observes the course of cause and effect whereby administrative law and administrative management of the people comes into being. More and more this feature becomes one of the growing issues of the day as people are irritated, vexed, restricted, and disturbed so much by the rules and regulations which have been issued in ever-increasing quantities as a result of that law. Who will assert that we are not today a Nation managed by administrators and officers of Government who are not responsible to the people at the ballot box and who quite often are not too responsive to the needs and the desires of the people? They do not have to appear before the electorate at stated periods and there test out the justice, fairness, and durability of the administrative orders under which the Nation is today being managed.

Obviously, every reasonable person recognizes that in time of war there must be a marshaling of our resources so that we become a militant instrumentality for victory. But the important point is that in the administrative management of all the affairs of people there develops those unnecessary whims and caprices which too often cannot be justified. When that administrative authority is delegated and re-delegated from the top to the bottom until finally it is applied to the people at the grass-root levels, one encounters an invasion of the civil rights of humble people which can only bring about irritation, vexation, and disunity.

Every Member of this House is quite familiar in a first-hand way with the difficulty in controlling and in circumscribing the actions of administrators and in a proper review of their actions.

If the Congress undertakes to abolish a bureau or curtail an appropriation or excise an indefensible activity, it is promptly charged by some with an action which is contrary to the general welfare and the common good.

If it should appear that the courts may stand in the way, then the courts must be bypassed, as was the case when the Congress approved a provision in the Price Control Act under which the validity of an order, a regulation, or a price schedule cannot be passed upon in a State, territorial, or Federal court. Here is an instance where justice is a one-way street. Any citizen, any businessman may be brought into court for

a violation of an O. P. A. regulation, but if, on the other hand, a regulation threatens the very business life of an individual, he has no choice save to spend time and money and come to the Nation's Capital in the hope that he can have a hearing in the Emergency Court of Appeals, which is the only tribunal for review under the Price Control Act. If Congress threatens the life or function of an agency and cannot be turned back, then public opinion must be managed to prevail upon the Congress to permit that agency to function, and here we encounter the thousands who are on the Federal rolls today writing releases, issuing bulletins, and preparing radio scripts for the consumption of the country. Finally, to make this pattern of administrative control complete, so many policies are invested with some kind of more significance. You may have observed in the President's message in connection with his proposal for a national service act that it was characterized as a unifying moral force and as an expression of democracy.

Here is the unmistakable pattern of what we have been encountering for the last decade. There has been an adventure of government into many fields of activity which show up in the form of bureaucracy expenditure, debt, taxation, restrictions upon the people, restrictions upon business and a vitiation of States rights. Every activity must be translated in terms of money and so there is before us today another money bill for \$8,500,000,000 for which there must be offsetting revenues or borrowed funds which can be derived only from wages, from profits and from rewards.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman feel, as I have felt in the last three or four years, that there has been some deliberate, concerted effort to change our constitutional form of Government, and that one of those changes is to be brought about by the destruction of the confidence of the people of this country in the Congress?

Mr. DIRKSEN. A little later I shall allude to the observations of my friend from Minnesota.

If a managed economy is to continue with all the controls that have already been imposed upon the Nation and if in addition to the many functions and activities which are already undertaken by Government there is to be an extension of such activities, they must obviously be reflected in terms of larger Federal pay rolls, greater restrictions, greater burdens upon industry and business, larger expenditures, higher taxes, and increasing difficulty for our system of free enterprise to assume these burdens and to provide the jobs which must be provided in the post-war period if we are to escape economic and social turbulence. If the jobs are not provided, then what happens to the proposed second Bill of Rights and what happens to our system of free enterprise?

Already there is some hint of what is in the air. There has been much discussion of a post-war program of public

works. It was alluded to in the President's message. If private enterprise is restricted by the difficulties of taxes, slow contract terminations, and Government management to the point where it might fail to produce the number of jobs that are necessary to provide for demobilized men of the armed services and the workers who will be demobilized from war industries, then Government will be expected to step in with a massive public works program which will reach into every community in the land, and which, no doubt, will be administered and controlled from the Nation's Capital.

If the past is any criterion of the future, it will be managed through regional, State, local, and district offices. All these will have to be staffed with personnel. All these will require public funds for their operation. The projects which will be pursued will require substantial funds for their construction and their servicing. The whole pattern of control will doubtless be maintained and once more we encounter the branches rather than the roots in the form of bureaucracy, expenditure, taxation, and debt. The alternative to this, of course, will be the preservation of the free enterprise system with adequate management so that it can operate effectively and produce the rewards, the wages, the jobs, the high and stable national income wherein lies our only real hope.

Such a controlled program will be quite in line with the philosophy which we have been pursuing for a long time and which carries us further and further toward a collective system wherein the individual is submerged. The whole emphasis is upon the collective good in which the individual is but an atom and if his personality and freedom is submerged long enough the appetite for freedom is starved and the interest in a free enterprise system is impaired.

In this connection I noted that not so long ago a very interesting phrase which can be found on page 47 of the Wagner security bill which was introduced on June 3, 1943. It reads as follows:

In each area the provision of general medical benefit for all individuals entitled to receive such benefit shall be a collective responsibility of all qualified general practitioners in the area who have undertaken to furnish such benefit.

I need not transgress upon your patience by reciting the basic purposes of so many other measures where the collective philosophy is emphasized nor how it will be extended and implemented through burdensome restrictions upon the free enterprise system. That system may then be unable to function as it should in meeting its post-war responsibilities.

In this connection let me ask this question: Can it be said that since 1933 there has been a truly bona fide self-generated boom in this country? As one looks over the years, he is now confronted with the conclusion that we have received economic stimulus from Government programs which have been controlled from the top or from the stimulus of war. Are we now to reconcile ourselves to the conviction that the eco-

nomic machine of this Nation cannot function unless it is nurtured, stimulated, and controlled by Government activity? If and when that confession is made, it will be disastrous, indeed, to our whole system of free enterprise.

It appears to me that if we are to preserve a free private enterprise system, we must give it a chance. If we are to maintain a high national income in the post-war period, we must give the system a chance to provide jobs. We must preserve the incentives which make that system work. We must preserve the freedom which is an essential part of that system. Undue burdens and controls must be relaxed and must be removed as rapidly as possible. It must be freed from administrative management on the part of government. It must be encouraged by simplification and modification of our tax structure. It must be freed from the blight of bureaucracy. All these obviously stem from greater and greater expansion of Federal activities. Here then is the root where the ax must be laid. A managed economy insofar as I can determine from my reading in history has not once succeeded in 6,000 years. One can examine scriptural history and find no evidence of the success of a managed economy. It either fails or moves on to a form of total government. The effort of Diocletian nearly seventeen hundred years ago is a fair example of how management has been tried long ago. If I remember correctly, he even devised a kind of O. P. A. under which 800 items were under strict control. He was deluded into the belief that it was going to be permanent because it appears that he had ceiling prices engraved on stone but notwithstanding his ability, his force, and his determination, it proved a miserable failure.

The idea of complete management of the affairs of people by government at the top is but a part of the concept of collectivism. For, if it prevails, it will inevitably destroy freedom and despoil the dignity of the individual and individual personality. Freedom is the essence of our free enterprise system under which we have marched to world leadership in a hundred and fifty years.

By way of recapitulation let me, therefore, say that our last and best hope in a world that is engulfed by war and bitterness is the preservation of the free enterprise system, because it represents the best hope of providing the jobs and the stable national income from which we can support the inescapable fiscal obligations which are being piled up to astronomical heights by global conflict. To preserve that system and give it health and vigor will require encouragement and the maintenance of those incentives upon which it rests.

It must not be burdened into stagnation and decay with taxes, restrictions, centralization of power, arbitrary rulings, the gospel of defeatism, collectivism, and a trend toward total government.

We as a Congress can do much in that direction.

We can carefully scrutinize the authority which we delegate to Federal ad-

ministrative agencies and provide the limitations under which they operate so that this will remain a nation of law and not of administrative rule.

We can carefully scrutinize every measure which is presented here in order to prevent the complete destruction of State authority and the absolute centralization of power in the Federal Government. We shall encounter that very problem in the proposal now pending before committees of House and Senate to completely federalize the unemployment compensation system. Presently it operates satisfactorily as a dual Federal-State system. If it is nationalized, it will be so much further removed from the grass-roots level and mean one further step toward total power.

We can carefully weigh and value every proposed expansion of Federal power for in so doing, we cannot only hold bureaucracy in check but expenditure of public funds as well, and therefore create the prospect for ultimate tax reduction and the diminution of this burden upon the very source from which post-war jobs are expected.

We can carefully scrutinize every proposal to make certain that the power of the judiciary is not impaired. When there is no longer an opportunity for a citizen to go before a judge and there test out his rights as against government, then indeed has one of the real incentives of free enterprise been destroyed.

We can scrutinize the Federal rolls to determine whether the burden of the Federal pay roll can be reduced and whether greater efficiency can be stimulated. With nearly 3,000,000 persons on the rolls compared with about 900,000 at the end of the last war, here is a fruitful field wherein much work can be done.

We can crusade against the subtle poison of defeatism which is scattered about by those who would like to induce the belief that this Nation has reached maturity and that from now on its resources must be managed from the top with a view to dividing rather than multiplying what we have. What a sad confession on the part of anyone who has reviewed the recent history of this Nation to contend that we have reached the ceiling of achievement and that the only hope of the future lies in dividing what has been accumulated. To them, one is tempted to say, "O ye of little faith."

One need but compare the production of steel and aluminum in 1900 with 1940 or 1943. One need but compare the number of homes wired for electricity in that 40-year period. One need but compare the creature comforts of today with those of two generations ago. One need but compare our standards of living with those of 2 score years ago to ascertain how far we have come.

It is reminiscent of the report made by the Commissioner of Patents to Congress in 1844 and again in 1876 when that worthy agent of the Government advised Congress that there had been such advances in science, commerce, and industry that the future betokened little hope of further advance.

Today, there are too many otherwise intelligent persons who are talking of apple sellers on street corners and of grass growing in the streets. There are too many, especially in government, who believe we have reached the end of the economic trail and that from here on, we can only survive if bright minds, steeped in the collective philosophy are entrusted with the management of our national affairs. I can think of no better way to destroy confidence in the system of free private enterprise than to distill this noxious philosophy to the people to the point where they are persuaded that our economic machine is but a mass of junk and no longer capable of functioning. In this philosophy of defeatism and despair lies the danger of total government. It is time for a note of faith and courage and for the tonic of total good will.

We can do more.

This Congress could appoint a special committee, assisted with experts, to assess and explore the policy and action legislation of the last decade and determine in what respect the courts have been bypassed, the powers of Congress have been indiscriminately handed over, the power of rule and regulation abused, and burdens placed upon the enterprise system which makes it difficult for that system to operate. It is not a case of repealing statutes. It is a case of refining statutes to the point where we can once more say that there is a balanced system of government in the land. I am not insensible of the fact that our course must be forward and upward. There must be ever improved standards for our people. There must be expanded security. There must be greater opportunity. But must liberty and sound government be sacrificed to achieve all these? Will anyone contend that our political and economic system is not sufficiently elastic to provide an expanded pattern of good living without the destruction of the system?

By getting back to the main highway of government, we can best serve our economic future. The best road map I know of in getting to that highway and remaining there is the preamble to the Constitution. It sets forth the purposes for which this Government was ordained and then sets out the structure under which those purposes are to be achieved. It has worked for 150 years. What reason is there to believe it will not continue to work, notwithstanding the dislocations which have sprung from the crucible of war a generation ago and again today?

In my opinion, all this adds up to a vital tradition and a way of life which we call America. It is a faith. It is hard to define. But whether it is consciously defined or not, it is the sustaining force by which we have grown great and is also the sustaining force which is the only comfort of the young Americans in uniform who are on freedom's frontier.

For what do they fight? Is it for buildings or soil or concrete highways or the other physical appurtenances of this land? It is all of these and none of

these. It is opportunity, freedom, faith, and continuous tradition which we call "Country." It does not have to be defined. It can be felt. And freedom is the very essence of that vital faith. Without it what else is left?

Out where they are, the novelty of a bomber of a machine gun or a Garand rifle is soon worn off. War becomes a grim and bitter business. The soldier must have a sustaining faith. That faith is his native land. It is the thing to which he wants to return.

When he comes back, he wants to find it pretty much as he left it. He don't want those fundamental things disturbed. He wants a job that is not dominated by a Federal official. He wants a home which is not supervised by a Federal agency. He wants a freedom that is not spotted with controls and regulations from the top. He wants a free opportunity which is not contingent upon the caprice of a governmental official. What irony it would be, if when he returned from the wars and from the crusade for the freedoms, he should find that the one big freedom which he left behind should have been impaired or foreclosed while he was gone.

As Senator O'MAHONEY said some months ago in a Readers' Digest article, "They are making America over and the people won't like it."

To that I answer that we can have progress without destruction. There is upon us a solemn responsibility that we dare not dodge.

In the hearts and minds of people everywhere is a resurgence of the conviction that the system of free private enterprise under which we grew to greatness is our one great hope. It is the heart-line which is the real second front of America.

By placing the ax at the root instead of the branches, by probing deep for the causes from which our present ills spring, we shall find the way to a solution for the problems which lie ahead.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. ROWE. In the very beginning of the gentleman's talk he referred to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill and also referred to the 6-percent contemplated increase. Of course, that is only one-half of what is intended to be assessed, 6 percent falling also on industry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not true that the 12-percent tax actually and finally falls upon the man in the low-income bracket with greatest weight and becomes in a sense a kind of income tax against which he is protesting at the present time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is substantially true, because these taxes will be reflected in the goods and services which the consumer must purchase.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to have been privileged to hear the splendid speech made by the gentle-

man from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I have nothing to say in reply to that speech. I am in hearty accord with most of the philosophical statements; possibly not always with the conclusions, although that is merely a reservation of caution.

Having to follow the gentleman from Illinois, for a little while reminds me of the closing debate in the life of Patrick Henry. He was a candidate for the United States Senate or for Governor or something. The man to follow him was John Randolph, of Roanoke. An old farmer listening to the address for quite a little while, after Henry had concluded, said, "Tut, tut, tut. It is merely the tinkling of a tin pan after the music of a fine church organ."

As I recall, that was the quotation. I admire the spirit in which the address was presented, which reminds me also of a statement of Patrick Henry, in the convention, when he said:

I am no longer a Virginian; I am no longer a New Englander; I am no longer a Marylander; I am an American.

I wish sometimes on this floor we could all remember that, and avoid partisan crimination and recrimination and remember we are fighting all for America and the death role that is being made in this Congress.

But, that is not what I came here to speak about. Yesterday one of the members of the committee delivered a speech which commented at times on the very large expenditures of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. I feel sometimes myself that possibly waste has existed, but gentleman, they have built the ships, and they carried the guns; they have carried the munitions; they have carried the cargoes, they have carried the men, they are winning the war, and no organization or instrumentality in this country has exceeded the splendid work that the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration has done.

There have been very troublesome problems. Some of those problems have almost killed me and I reckon some members of my committee. Some of them were troublesome compensation problems which we had written into one of the acts. If you gentleman have not undertaken to reconcile legislation such as existed there, you do not know what difficulties we had to meet. It has been difficult to find reconciliation that would permit the Maritime Commission to reduce the cost of these ships on many occasions and conform with the just compensation provision of the Constitution, which neither you nor I can interfere with. We have tried to work out through a council consisting of three of the ablest judges of the United States, a method whereby that might be done. The shipping companies in many cases were willing to go along with a settlement which exceeded the limitations that we had placed on them, but still did conform with the Constitution and the allowances what the courts might possibly have determined to be just compensation. I think considerable patriotism has been shown.

Comments were made in debate as to the investigational work of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Let me remind you that that committee has jurisdiction not only over the merchant marine and fisheries but also the Coast Guard, the Geodetic Survey, navigation aids, such as lighthouses and buoys, merchant-marine hospitals, and the Panama Canal. It has reported out much legislation and in its investigational capacity there have been made reports dealing with matters that have come from the General Accounting Office. We have tried to be fair. The reports have not always met with the views of the Accounting Office or everyone else, but we have tried to deal with them in a spirit of fairness and justice. Some comment was made that there were other matters that ought to be reported on. Let me tell you that there is in transcript in process of printing and report, to be prepared in the near future, on the matter of charter rates to the Red Sea. It was deemed essential to secure the stock reports of those companies for the last year and they were very late in coming in. There was nothing the committee could do to hurry the reports, and they are essential. Two companies have made refunds since the committee's hearing, the Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co., in the sum of approximately \$200,000, and the American President Lines, in the sum of approximately \$110,000.

The investigation which was made at South Portland will result in savings very nearly, as I recall, of \$5,000,000. The committee has had in all \$100,000 for the several years.

Plate-fracture subcommittee—statistics relative to fractures to January 1, 1944, at hand awaiting action by the subcommittee.

Comptroller General's report on Morgan Line—investigation of date under way in preparation for hearing.

Rheem Manufacturing Co.—hearings have been held at which the Maritime Commission and the principal subcontractors have been heard. Hearings of Rheem Manufacturing Co. will occur on February 9.

St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co.—investigation of affairs of the company at the site have been completed and are awaiting hearings.

Subcommittee on Ship Production—report of west coast inspection is in process of preparation.

Many matters have come from the committee to the Congress, and some of its members by reason of physical condition have carried on under great difficulty. I think there has been a remarkable showing.

Sometime ago a speech was made on the floor of the House by one of the Members for whom I hold the highest esteem, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], on October 26. That was at the time he introduced a resolution to investigate operations of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. I have a report that I asked be prepared at that time by the Maritime Commission in comment on

and answer to the various charges contained in that speech, some 12 in number.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert this memorandum which came to me from the Maritime Commission as part of my remarks on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to obtain that permission in the House rather than in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLAND. I should have remembered that. I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. BLAND. Perhaps 1 minute.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to assure the membership of the House that this legislative committee is as anxious as the members of the Appropriations Committee, and other Members of the House to reduce expenditures, but we are facing a terrific fight in the post-war world when the effort will be made again to drive the American flag from the seas, and, God helping me, they shall not do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell me how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has remaining 1 hour and 15½ minutes; the gentleman from Illinois, 21 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] 21 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not spend a great deal of the committee's time this afternoon. There are two or three things I wish to speak about; one is this bill. There are some things in it that I believe are provided for rather liberally and can be trimmed some and I hope that when we get to the reading of the bill they may be corrected.

I wish to talk for a moment about a couple of things that are outside the range of this bill. The first is the Office of War Information. Perhaps some of those in the Chamber now will remember that I called attention to certain things when an appropriation for that organization was before the House, and called attention to the way they were operating and to the fact that their broadcasts were not in the interests of our war effort.

At this point I am going to put in the RECORD, in accordance with consent that was granted me in the House, an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Sherwood's Foresters." The article follows:

SHERWOOD'S FORESTERS

Both the war effort and our good name abroad have hardly been aided by the high-handed and bizarre operations of Robert E. Sherwood's overseas branch of the Office of War Information. The wonder arises over the long tolerance of those operations. One reason is doubtless the bond of friendship existing between writers for the newspapers and writers for the O. W. I. Old colleagues hate to start stone throwing. Moreover, O. W. I. has invoked the aid of newspaper writers, who thereupon feel, in some vague way, that

they have an equal stake with staff members in shielding O. W. I. The result is that O. W. I. has not had the criticism which its overseas operations in general deserve. The criticism has mainly been esoteric, restricted to circulation in the black market which, as we have previously shown, prospers on much better news than ever appears on the public counters. Stories of the way the "Ruritans" must have split their sides over this or that broadcast have become part of the folklore of wartime Washington. Mr. Davis' definitive threat of resignation makes at long last for a show-down.

Fortunately for the war effort, the War Department already has taken measures to protect the war effort from the asinities perpetrated by the O. W. I. broadcast control. The step follows a suggestion which had been made several times in the Post. A psychological warfare branch has been set up, with a unit attached to every army. From now on O. W. I. and O. S. S. in the field will function directly under this unit's instructions, though O. W. I. will be left, of course, to disseminate propaganda over the seven seas from the New York headquarters. Thus the general problem remains. Nor will it necessarily be solved by the resignation of Mr. Davis. For that would be interpreted as a triumph for Mr. Sherwood and a new lease of life for the autocratic Warburg-Barnes-Johnson group which flourishes in New York in consequence of Mr. Sherwood's influence at the White House.

Mr. Sherwood's control over the overseas branch always has been shadowy. So far as we can make out, he descends from his eyrie, where he doubtless contrasts the dreamworld of his plays with the world as it really is, only to sign blank checks of authority to his foresters in the jungle below. What is going to happen to them? Clearly they must be brought under some kind of control. From all accounts they are independent even of the brain trust on Mr. Davis' pay roll in Washington. Here there are real experts who know the countries that we are propagandizing. But the Warburg-Barnes-Johnson satrapy, evidently, are averse from using their material. The reasons seem to be, first, that it is related specifically to the country to be talked to, and, secondly, that facts must be subordinated to opinions. This is one world to the ideology boys in New York in which Arab and Norwegian can be equally appealed to with the same pabulum.

Mr. Sherwood's operations, as we have said before, should be brought under control of the State Department, and more attention should be paid to the foreign correspondents, who, given any kind of access to material, would do a good deal of O. W. I.'s job abroad gratis and, obviously, with far better effect. Mr. Edward Weintal sought to encourage this aid when he acted as liaison officer between the O. W. I. and the foreign correspondents. But for some inexplicable reason Mr. Davis decided to dispense with both him and the job. It may be, in the light of the present ruckus, that the overseas branch had as little use for the foreign correspondents as for the experts in the O. W. I. Perhaps, since the branch acts as if all values had been overturned, it thought of the work of those correspondents as unfair competition.

It is apparent from this article that the foreign branch of the Office of War Information under Mr. Sherwood is utterly worthless and is a liability to our war effort. It is apparent from that article, as I stated on the floor a couple of months ago, that the activities relating to propaganda have had to be taken over by the War Department and that what this outfit does out of New York and what it does in the nature of supplying help for the war effort does not count in the

slightest degree. That feature is bad enough but in addition to that they are following the same thing with reference to their domestic set-up.

I call attention to a letter which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] on Wednesday of this week sent to Mr. Davis, Director of the Office of War Information. It appears that Mr. Alan Cranston, Chief of the Foreign Language Division in the O. W. I. has placed on the rolls a man named Adam Kulikowski as a member of the Foreign Language Division in the United States Office of War Information. Mr. Kulikowski is supposed to have ideas contrary to those of the people who believe in the Constitution of the United States. He is charged with having a poor knowledge of Polish and being unable to speak anything better than pigeon Polish, bearing definite trace of Russian grammar, etymology, and syntax. He is stirring up a lot of trouble among the Polish people in the large centers of the United States. Why should the Government of the United States place that kind of a person upon the pay roll to stir up trouble among our people, a man who misrepresents the attitude of the Polish people here in this country?

It has long been known by those who would be frank with the Congress and it has long been said that the Office of War Information is without executive management. It has also been said that that branch of the overseas service under Mr. Sherwood, together with Mr. Barnes, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Warburg, is not doing a job to help the war effort. It is perfectly apparent that the effort that was made here and which failed to cut \$4,000,000 out of the appropriation for this group was clearly in the interest of the war effort and should have been carried. I am in hopes that when we get to considering another bill for the Office of War Information the interests of the United States will come first and that we will not go ahead and appropriate a lot of money for things that are not in the interest of our war effort.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word or two about a bill that will be brought before the House on Tuesday next, as I understand it, which would permit the soldiers to vote. Preliminarily, I want to refer to that very intemperate message that came here the other day from the President of the United States. He stated that the bill is a fraud. Personally I resent that kind of an accusation against a responsible and honored committee of this House. The statement was ill-considered, it was not based upon a knowledge of the bill, and evidently not upon the situation existing.

It is perfectly apparent that every Member of this House wants the soldiers to have the opportunity to vote. I want to see such a bill considered, not on the basis of wild statements made either by the President or by any of his supporters or by anyone in opposition to the bill, but entirely upon the merits, and with the idea of working out a bill which will permit the boys who are overseas fighting for us to vote. It is of the utmost importance that we give them that right,

it is of the utmost importance that we do it in such a way that their votes can be counted.

What are the constitutional provisions that we are up against and what is the situation with reference to the States? For a moment I wish to read a very few sections, a very few words out of certain sections of the Constitution, with reference to the qualifications of voters.

Article I, section 2, referring to the qualifications of voters for Representatives in Congress states:

And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding and so that it will not be necessary to repeat, I call attention to amendment No. 17 of the Constitution where the same language is provided for the qualifications of those who might vote for United States Senator in each State.

Now I would like to call attention to section 4, article I, reading:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators.

There is also this provision, section 5:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

That is section 5 of article I.

Article II, section 1, reads in part as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

Section 2 of amendment XIV perhaps has some bearing on it. It reads as follows:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

These are the sections that I intend to have in the RECORD as a part of my statement.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. May I call the gentleman's attention to a further sentence in section 1 of article II. The gentleman has read that portion which provides for

the selection of electors in the manner prescribed by the legislatures of the several States. Following that there is one other sentence I should like to mention. It is this:

The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

A similar section with respect to the Members of Congress grants to us authority to legislate with respect to the manner of holding elections, but in the case of a President we are given that authority. The authority does not go as to the manner of holding an election, but merely as to the time of choosing electors.

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Would the gentleman state how he voted on the Ramsey bill that passed a few years ago? That is the bill waiving the payment of a poll tax as a condition precedent to the voting of the men in the service, and also waiving registration.

Mr. TABER. I cannot recall how I voted without having the bill in front of me. Is the gentleman familiar with that?

Mr. MCCORMACK. If I did know how my friend voted I would not state it. I thought he might know. However, assuming the argument of my friend is correct, would it not apply equally against that bill, because Congress by that bill waived the necessity of paying a poll tax.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will listen a little longer he will see that I am making no argument. I am simply stating facts, and calling attention to certain things that I desire to have in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members when they come to meet this situation. I am not stating a definite position upon anything. I have stated that I felt that for the purpose of considering this legislation which is coming up, as I understand, on Tuesday—if I am not correct on that I should like to be corrected.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. I felt that these things should be brought to the attention of the Members that they may understand some of the problems we are up against in meeting this legislation.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman knows I have great respect and friendship for him. In view of the gentleman's statement, with his permission I will withdraw the questions I asked.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I have not taken any definite position as to any specific language or anything of that kind and I do not intend to do so here today. I do intend to call attention, if I have the opportunity, to several things that I feel should be considered and should be met, so that when we give the soldiers the vote that vote can be counted, and its counting can be enforced just as far as it is possible to do

so. That is my object in rising here today. I hope the problem is approached by every Member of the House not with the idea of involving the thing in a lot of preconceived prejudices or with the desire to follow someone, but with the desire to pass a bill which will hold water and give these boys the vote. That is the only thought I have in mind at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think no finer thought could be entertained by any Member or no finer expression could be made than what the gentleman has just stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I would hope that this problem would be approached on Tuesday not with the idea of putting the bill through just because it is somebody's bill or because somebody is back of it, but so that our soldier boys may have the right to vote and vote their own convictions, without the least bit of pressure or anything of that kind upon them; and I would hope that everyone here, regardless of the middle aisle, would take that same position.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Whether or not the gentleman voted for the bill that was passed a couple of years ago, the mere fact that a man made a mistake and voted for an unconstitutional bill at one time is no reason why he should continue to do the same thing, especially on a bill like this that involves the very existence of States' rights. There is an old saying that while the lamp holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return. We are ready to welcome the gentleman from Massachusetts back into the constitutional fold when we get through winning this battle for States' rights.

Mr. TABER. I do not want to get involved in any discussion along the line of States' rights or anything else. What I want to get to as we approach the problem is this: It is apparent from the sections of the Constitution I have read that the Congress in itself has nothing to do with the qualifications or the counting of the ballots for electors for President. The Congress might have certain jurisdiction, if you so construe the language of these sections, with reference to the voting and to certain qualifications with regard to the office of Senator or of Representative in Congress. Under those circumstances, it looks to me as if it were incumbent upon the Congress to see to it just as far as is possible for us to do that these boys have the right to vote for President. I want to see this thing put up to them, and put up so that it will do some good.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, like the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I, too,

have great respect for the sincerity of the gentleman from New York, but I think that he will admit that in all questions that confront us there are different ideas as to the constitutional interpretations. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] to my mind made a fine exposition of the constitutional questions involved, and he relied upon the war powers of the Congress, and points out, justly so, I think, that where they do obtain, they transcend all other provisions of the Constitution, and even transcend State laws and also Federal laws and State constitutions, and he drew an analogy of how in the last war the Congress passed a law reaching into the State courts and stopping actions at law against members of the armed forces, with the idea of protecting their civil rights, something which Congress could have no right to do except under the war powers; and then he argues, and I think rightly so, that if the Congress has a right to protect the civil rights of the armed forces, that political rights rise even higher, and that Congress has a right to control them, and by getting an effective ballot to the soldiers, would not that be a tremendous factor in morale for fighting the war?

Mr. TABER. That is why I want to see an effective ballot sent to them, not one that will not be counted when it gets back home. Perhaps that is not the way to approach the problem.

Mr. WRIGHT. Oh, I think it is, and I think the gentleman's approach is sincere. I am very much interested in what he says.

Mr. TABER. I hope when we get to this situation on Tuesday, that absolute sincerity with reference to the working out of something that will permit these boys to vote will be the thing that we will have in mind, and that we will not be like the country lawyer—be more insistent on our own verbiage than we are on getting somewhere.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I cannot find out what bill it is that we are going to have before us on Tuesday. I was just in the Clerk's office, and I got an armful of bills on this question. I was told that it would be Senate 1225. Is that the bill? What is the bill that we are going to consider on Tuesday?

Mr. MICHENER. Who is the author of the bill the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. GILCHRIST. They do not know in the Clerk's office.

Mr. CASE. I think the gentleman refers to the bill that is on the House Calendar.

Mr. MICHENER. The rule provides that the committee bill, the report of which was written by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will be brought up for consideration. The minority bill, the so-called Worley bill, will be in order to be offered as a substitute. That is as far as the rule goes. It is a wide-open rule and any amendments that the House desires to offer may be offered.

Mr. CASE. A substitute would be in order?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; always. It is my own view that the Senate bill probably will be over here and will be in order also as a substitute.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time for debate, and I ask that the Clerk read the first paragraph of the bill.

The Clerk read to the end of line 7 on page 1.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4070, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. I wonder if the Chair could tell us what the program is for next week?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill now under consideration will continue on Monday. It is assumed that the bill will be concluded on Monday. If so, the soldiers' vote bill will be next in order on Tuesday. If this bill be not disposed of on Monday, then it will be disposed of on Tuesday, and the next business in order will be the soldiers' vote bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Then there being 4 hours of general debate on the soldiers' vote bill, probably we will not reach the bill under the 5-minute rule until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would be the idea of the Chair; yes. The probability is that Tuesday will be occupied in general debate, and that on Wednesday the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] be permitted to extend his remarks he made today by inserting a brief memorandum in respect to charges made by Representative ROBERT F. JONES in October 1943, regarding the War Shipping Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to revise and extend all the remarks he made today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to print as a part of my remarks section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR FOR 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 208) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two separate matters, and to include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ROLL-CALL VOTE ON THE SOLDIER-VOTE BILL

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few things about the soldier-vote bills in order to try to get them in some permanent form in the RECORD. Some may ask, What can be the significance of a roll-call vote on a

move for the previous question when the rule for the soldier vote is under consideration on Tuesday? Some can say, "We do not see how that has any possible significance. We do not understand how you can attribute to it any special importance."

I am reminded at this time of a newspaper story that goes back into my early newspaper experiences. A newspaper in the city of Denver, one that was sometimes greatly interested in getting publicity for itself, got a private tip that the price of milk was to be reduced in the city of Denver a half cent a quart 4 days later. On the following morning it lowered the masthead of the newspaper to print prominently a terrific blast against the milk industry of Denver and said, "We demand that the price of milk be reduced at least a half cent for the sake of the poor children, and if it is not, this paper will tear to shreds the present combination that has been able to preserve artificial prices."

The next day it came out with additional vigorous and violent editorials, and the following day with the same sort of thing. The next morning, of course, the decrease in the price of milk, which was already agreed upon, became effective. That newspaper praised itself to the skies. What ordinarily would have been worth half a stickful on the front page became worth columns of front-page editorial comment. When I reminded one of the men connected with that sheet that they had blown up the story a little bit he said to me, "News is what you make it."

I say to this House that a vote is what you make it and a roll call has the significance that you are able to place behind it and behind the reasons that motivate the Members of the House in asking for it. When Tuesday comes, after an hour's debate upon the rule, the previous question will be moved and in the ordinary fashion of this House the previous question would be ordered without a dissenting word.

But on Tuesday that is not going to be the situation. The chairman of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President and Representatives in Congress will stand and demand a ye-and-nay vote on the question and we are convinced that plenty of people will stand with him to see that there is a ye-and-nay vote. Why does he want a ye-and-nay vote on the previous question prior to the adoption of a rule? Is it only so that the matter can be brought before the House? No; because that is one of the certain ways in which you can get an absolute record vote on this important question. So I say to you, do not pay any attention to what an ordinary roll call on the previous question might mean. There will be significance in this Tuesday vote. It will be built into the significant vote by the people who are demanding that there shall be a clear-cut roll-call vote on the question whether or not there will be a simple, uniform, Federal ballot used in the election by these men and women in the armed services who serve us in all parts of the world.

That is the privilege of any group. That is the privilege of this distinguished body of Congress if it desires. Those of us who are devoted to the principles of the Worley bill have a perfect right to try to make sure there shall be a significant and clear-cut expression on that proposed legislation.

So I say to you that concerning Tuesday next, word can just as well go out now over the country that to vote for the previous question is to vote to prevent a sure record vote on the principles of the Worley bill; and a vote against the previous question is evidence that the Member desires to take the first step to make possible a sure record vote on the question of uniform Federal ballots for our servicemen.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am wondering if the gentleman from New Mexico has anybody in mind; that is, any Congressman who is not ready to show his colors on this vote. Does the gentleman have anybody particularly in mind?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I can tell better after the roll call on the previous question on Tuesday.

Mr. JENSEN. My fine colleague and able Representative from New Mexico would not infer that there is any Member of Congress who is not ready to vote his convictions at any time on this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No; I would not infer there was any Member of Congress not ready to vote his convictions, but I just want to be very sure when the boys who are serving all over the world come home they will be able to look up some record and find who wanted to give them a Federal uniform ballot, because I am afraid, and I will later come to that, I am afraid there will be no assurance that they will get that type of ballot under any other kind of law.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico on the gallant fight he has made to bring about a record vote on this vital issue. I would like to say in answer to the question just asked him that many Members on the Democratic side appeared before the Committee on Rules to beg that they be given a chance to go on record on this vital issue. In some manner the record vote was denied in the Rules Committee. We were not given a chance to vote this main question up or down according to our own convictions.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I accompanied the gentleman from Oklahoma to the Rules Committee to plead and ask for that opportunity for a sure, clear-cut record vote on that issue.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure that we all want to be fair about this.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes; I have tried to be fair.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman appeared before the Committee on Rules and the other gentlemen and asked for an open rule. The printed record will so show.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. If it does, it will be a very bad record, because I did not ask for just that, as the gentleman from Michigan knows.

Mr. MICHENER. If I may be permitted to continue my observation, the gentleman appeared and I asked him if he was asking for an open rule. I understood him to say he was. The majority of the committee asked for an open rule. Then I said, "What the gentleman wants is to go further than an open rule. He wants a special rule. The gentleman does not want a rule under the general rules of the House." You said in substance, "Well, we want an opportunity to assure a record vote, regardless of the rules of the House." Then we discussed motions to recommit. I said to you, and I think you agreed, that under the rule which you have here there can be a record vote.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I will agree with the gentleman there can be, but there is not a certainty.

Mr. MICHENER. What I do not want is to have the very fair gentleman from New Mexico inadvertently imply that the Rules Committee was attempting to do something to prevent a vote under the rules of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I just want to say this to my good friend from Michigan. He knows my high respect for him. At no time have I implied any improper action on the part of the Committee on Rules. I did not criticize what the Rules Committee had done. In fact, I never even mentioned the Committee on Rules until he himself mentioned it.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, there was no doubt in his mind exactly what kind of rule we desired regardless of the description applied to it. Did not the gentleman know we wanted a rule which would permit us to have a record vote on providing a regular, uniform, Federal ballot along with the State ballot?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; he took the committee at its word. I said right away I would vote for the open rule asked for under the general rules of the House. Under such a procedure, there can be a vote on every proposal if the House so desired. By voting down the previous question, the House can work its will, and it will work its will.

This rule in no way prevents or can prevent a vote on the Worley bill if a majority of the House wants it, without the arbitrary intervention of the Rules Committee coming in and telling the House that it has to work its will in a peculiar way, figured out and written by the Rules Committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Now, let me state this so that we understand

each other. I am not trying to prevent the House from working its will, but I want that will to be also the will of the American people with reference to soldier voting. I think the mothers and fathers who have sent their boys into the armed services all over the world want those boys to have a vote if those boys want it.

What is going to be the situation before this House? The Rules Committee, although it was asked by the chairman of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress to grant two roll calls, decided that it was not within the province of the committee, or at least was not the proper action. We called the attention of the Rules Committee many times to the fact that it had happened before, and we called attention to the peculiar circumstances that existed. The rules of this House provide that the minority party shall have the right to make a motion to recommit. What is the action of the minority party on this matter? When the soldier-vote legislation came before the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, every Republican member of the committee voted against the Worley bill and for the other bill, with the result that the actual minority is represented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] and if we wanted to be fair we would say, "Yes, representing the minority on this bill, you shall have that right to move to recommit on the grounds you prefer."

But I do not wish to tear down the rules and traditions of this House. I do not want to take away from the minority party the privilege that it has of making a motion to recommit. So rather than attack the action of the Rules Committee, rather than to say it was improper or unjust—because that committee is charged with preserving the traditions of this House—we said, "There is a very simple way, and that is to place on something a significance that it does not ordinarily have, and announce to the country that it will have that significance," and then state it so clearly and so many times before the vote is taken that no one thereafter will be able to deny what the significance of that vote was.

That does not tear down the rules of the House. That lets the chips fall where they belong.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to have the gentleman's advice with reference to this matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I would advise my friend to vote for the uniform Federal ballot, because the boys will come home some day and tell you what they wanted.

Mr. CURTIS. All right. Suppose a Member is honestly convinced that the Worley bill will not give the soldiers the right to vote on a ballot that will be counted. I am admitting there is disagreement on that; but if a Member is convinced that the Worley bill will not

give the soldier the right to vote a ballot to be counted, should he still vote against the motion for the previous question because of the political significance that you attach to it?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I would not ask any man to do that. He could help a lot if he would. I would suggest that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] read the Worley bill, and he may then go with us all the way.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Personally, I want to express a little regret that we are getting so much heat engendered on the subject, because there are, despite the President's suggestion that people were not sincere in this, and that they were talking with their tongues in their cheeks—there are a great many Members in this House who are sincere and who want the soldiers' vote and want the soldiers to have a ballot to be counted when it comes back home.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I grant that.

Mr. CASE. On yesterday I called attention to the fact that a former Democratic Member of this body, Mr. W. D. Jamieson, of Iowa, has called attention to the fact that the Constitution of the State of Texas provides that absentee ballots cannot be counted unless they are provided by the election officials of Texas in a certain way. I do not know whether that is true or not, but Mr. Jamieson in his article said that, and he was surprised to find out that was a fact. The majority leader yesterday suggested various States which did not have provisions for absentee ballots. If we can keep this thing on something resembling a level without heat, it may be possible for a majority of the House to get together and work out a system whereby a ballot can be put into the hands of every soldier that will be counted when it gets back home.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is right, and remembering the contribution which the gentleman from South Dakota has made to this Nation by his simple amendment on renegotiation, I would be the last person in the world to question his motives, whether he votes for or against the Worley bill. He will vote his conscience, and I know it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I was a little disappointed in one thing that the gentleman said. The gentleman said that if we did not vote for a straight out Federal ballot we would feel it when the soldiers came home.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I said they would hear from them.

Mr. TABER. Now, I want the gentleman to consider this: Are we going to vote for something because it is right and the right thing to do, that will really give the soldiers a vote, or are we going to vote because we are afraid of our responsibilities? I am going to vote the way I

think I ought to vote, and I do not propose to do it because of fear. I believe that the soldiers, when they come back, will reward the fellow who stood up for what was right.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I subscribe to what the gentleman has said. All I meant to say was that when the boys come home they will know then whether they were able to participate in the 1944 elections. They will know whether ballots reached them. There will be no doubt in their minds.

I want to say this: I have a very real reason why I have become so interested in this soldier-vote legislation. It is not that I have a boy in the armed services that I am going to face when he comes back. I have a reason that enters into it that perhaps is peculiar to my State. New Mexico is one of the two States in the Union that has a constitutional bar that will not allow anybody to vote under the bill that is going to be reported to this House. No constitutional lawyer of any standing will stand up and say that under the bill which has been reported out by the majority members of the committee—not the Worley bill but the other bill—that one single New Mexico soldier can vote under that bill.

Why does that concern me? If you read today's paper, you read the horrible story of what happened to the boys in the Philippine Islands and on Bataan. I want to remind this House that the greatest percentage of men on Bataan came from the State of New Mexico. I need not remind this House that one-tenth of all the soldiers on Bataan were from my State with its small population. Five hundred thousand people contributed one-tenth of all the Bataan soldiers to a Nation of 130,000,000 people.

To say to that State that its boys cannot vote is a shame. I am going to do what I can to make it possible that the boys from my State, no matter where they may be, shall have a chance to vote. Constitutional lawyers will tell you that under the provision that says that the Congress has a right to regulate the time, place, and manner of elections for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress, the people of my State may vote, in spite of the peculiar constitutional requirements.

Now, I will be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the question asked by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] was a very fair one, but I have a different opinion from that expressed in the answer given by the gentleman from New Mexico. I think a Member could have honest convictions, clear convictions, that the bill reported out is for the best interests of those in the service, and still vote against the previous question upon the theory that this is an unusual situation. Certainly it is an unusual exception to the bills that come before the House generally. And in order to afford the membership a clear opportunity to vote one way or the other for both bills, a Member, even in his own conscience feeling that the Worley bill is not the one that we should pass, could then say "I think the Mem-

bers should be given an opportunity to have a straight vote on it."

We have done that before. It is an exception, of course, I admit a rare exception, but on that theory I believe the gentleman could reconcile his conscience. He has not indicated and I am not stating that he has reached a conclusion.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, yes; I have a conscience.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not indicating that the gentleman has reached a conclusion yet on this bill, a judgment; I do not know, but assuming the gentleman's judgment was that he should not vote for the Worley bill I still believe that under the unusual situation he would be justified in giving an opportunity to those in support of the Worley bill to have a straight vote on a second motion to recommit.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the majority leader. I was going to deal with that point later. I did not mean to answer the gentleman from Nebraska quite as quickly as it might have sounded. There is a great deal to what the majority leader has said. We should adopt some rule that would give the House the right really to express itself. I submit that the House should have the right to pass on the situation. I do not think it would bother the conscience of the gentleman from Nebraska in the slightest if he voted to give an opportunity on the floor of this House for us to have a direct vote on this question. I admit it is a question on which there are two sides. Some Members with absolute sincerity and the highest integrity could take one position and other Members could take another. I do not question the basis upon which any Member may reach it; I merely ask: Why do we not have a roll call where we can record ourselves and find out after it is over which bill did afford the soldiers an opportunity to vote?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to request the gentleman—I am not going to ask him to develop it here, but I would like for him to put in the RECORD, if he would, at the point where he stated something about what the law was in his own State, if he would put a little statement in that would give us a little clearer picture in the RECORD of what the law is in his State so that we may have an idea for ourselves how that might be handled in a legislative way here.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I shall be very glad to do it right now.

Mr. TABER. And how the Federal votes might be counted under the laws of his State.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. We have a peculiar constitutional provision in our State. At the time New Mexico came into the Union in 1912, there was submitted, prior to its admission to the Union—I may make some mistakes on constitutional law; the gentleman will recognize I am an insurance peddler and not a lawyer—there was a peculiar situation existing.

An attempt was made to put through a constitution which would probably have disfranchised eventually a portion of the New Mexican population on the ground that they could not read and write the English language but who were literate in Spanish, and in order that the right of Spanish-American citizens of that State should never be sacrificed by an English literacy clause there was a provision written into our constitution specifying that that section of the constitution relative to certain voting requirements could never be changed except by a two-thirds vote in every county and three-fourths vote over the State. One year ago, in 1942, an attempt was made in my State to amend that, to give the soldiers the right to vote. The amending resolution, I understand, carried in every county of the State but it did not get a two-thirds vote in all the counties or a three-fourths vote State-wide. The will of the people was that the soldiers should vote, but the peculiar constitutional provision defeated their will. The men who have studied the question—and I do not pose as a lawyer—have decided that it will be permissible to count these soldier votes on the Federal ballot basis under war-power and emergency conditions. We are anxious that the soldiers should vote. It is not a controversial political issue at all. Both parties are in agreement that the soldiers should vote on that type of Federal ballot.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I know that the gentleman from New Mexico wants to be fair, but I resent any inference that just because I may be in favor of a different bill than the Worley bill I am not in favor of legislation giving an opportunity to vote.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I have not implied that, I am sure; I have never implied that, not at all, in my statement. I have not talked about the merits of the bills at all except to suggest that I do want to see a roll call on that issue in the hope that finally we may determine who was right. I do not question anybody's motives; I do not say that a person who is not for the Worley bill is against the soldiers' voting; I do not go that far at all. I simply say that as far as my judgment leads me I think that the soldiers will not receive ballots in time to vote under any other bill and therefore I shall vote for the Worley bill. Any other Member of the House has a right to his own conscience and to his own interpretation of the situation.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has a certain condition in his own State, and, of course, that is the responsibility of his State. In my State the legislature is meeting now to arrange to set up machinery so that the soldiers from the State of Iowa may vote for everybody from President on down.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I want to remind the gentleman of the injunction of the Bible to be his brother's keeper and to help my people vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico on his statement that he was interested in the boys from his home State. That is my theory; that is the constitutional theory of the United States; that is the constitutional theory in my State, and I am very anxious to see the boys from Texas vote, but I am frank to say to the gentleman that I cannot agree with him that a short or Federal ballot will give a single boy in New Mexico a legal right to vote for President. On the other hand, in Texas there is a constitutional provision that does not allow them to vote for President but only for electors for the President. In my State, if Congress passes the bobtailed ballot or a Federal ballot at all, it will deprive every boy from my native State of the legal right to vote; in fact, if any of them did vote, they would violate the law in so doing. Not only would it be prohibited by the National Constitution but by the State constitution and by several statutes of that State. So I want to see a ballot that will work with my legislature and give at least 400,000 qualified voters from Texas the right to vote.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I recognize that but also disagree on some of these matters.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Here we have a perfect illustration of the situation I tried to mention yesterday: That in some States the bobtailed ballot might not be counted; in some other States a ballot might not be counted under some other circumstances. So I have been trying to resolve this thing in my own mind. I am not a member of the committee that has the responsibility of bringing out a bill on this subject; I recognize that; I have not pursued the matter far enough to put this proposal into bill form yet, but even so, in my thinking about it I have asked myself whether it would not be possible for the Federal Congress to pass a law which would say to the States that we have advised the Army and Navy that any ballot to reach all of the soldiers and sailors wherever they may be should get back in ample time to be counted and must be mailed at least 45 days or possibly 60 days in advance of the election; that the Federal Government will see to it, if you place the ballot in an envelope addressed with the name of the soldier or sailor and his Army or Navy serial number in our hands by such and such a date we will add to that his current address as determined by the records in the War and Navy Departments, which will be readily obtainable from the serial number, and we will send that to him so that he will have time to get it back; that if you do not provide us with the envelope with the regular State ballot, we will address an envelope and send him one of these short ballots and that the responsibility for counting such bal-

lots will rest upon the election officials of the several States when the ballot comes back.

The Federal Government, in my opinion, is responsible for destroying the residence of the soldiers and sailors, and because of this should restore that opportunity to the boys. That is not the responsibility of the States; it is our system with post-card requests for ballot and put it in his hands. If the State will provide us with a ballot addressed to him, we will put it in his hands. If the State does not, we will give him a short ballot, and the State officials can count that ballot or not; and such ballots will go to the election officials at home, and it will be their responsibility under their State laws.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. But one must take into consideration the fact that the Army and the Navy may have something to say about it, and I do not believe our Army and Navy officials feel that voting under a State ballot system with post-card requests for ballots when there are 10,000 status changes a day in our armed forces would be either feasible or certain.

Mr. CASE. I have gone into that matter, too, somewhat.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not believe it is going to be possible for them to distribute State ballots to all men in distant points, maybe 15 or 20 at some single spot in New Zealand or Iceland or Iran.

Mr. CASE. If they were addressed as I have indicated, each ballot would be simply an individual piece of mail.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. There has been testimony galore before the committee that it would be physically impossible to handle it that way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the chairman of the committee having charge of this bill comment on the possibility that the gentleman from South Dakota stated.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Texas said it could not be legally and constitutionally done, but, as the gentleman from New Mexico pointed out, lawyers often disagree. One statement made by the gentleman from Texas was to the effect they could not cast these ballots constitutionally. Let me remind him when the Seventy-seventh Congress passed a bill, Public Law 712, which waived registration and waived the payment of the poll tax to members of the armed forces if they were otherwise qualified under the laws of that State, that in the State of Texas more than 1,000 of those ballots were counted.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. They were actually counted? It is like the

story of the man who could not be put in jail. He was in jail.

Mr. WORLEY. He was there.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The ballots were counted?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes. Under date of January 17, 1944, the Honorable Sidney Latham, secretary of state, in the concluding paragraph of a letter to me stated:

From what I learn from those who were in the office at the time, the mechanics of this law were exceedingly difficult of administration, and only a small percentage of the votes cast were returned in time to be counted. It is to be hoped that your bill or one of the other pending bills can be so written as to provide a workable method of voting.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is the voice of experience?

Mr. WORLEY. That is the voice of experience.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I want the opportunity to answer the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes, I will give the gentleman the opportunity later. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Coming back to the Rules Committee, I was with the gentleman from New Mexico and also with the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the committee, and many others of my colleagues. I would not for 1 minute suggest that the Rules Committee was motivated by anything except the proper motives in the rule that it granted; but I do say that committee was overzealous of precedent. I say that the rule we asked for was an unusual rule, but we have an unusual situation. Had the Rules Committee granted the rule asked for by us, which would have provided for two motions to recommit, one to be at the disposal of the minority party and the other to be at the disposal of the Elections Committee, we would not have this fight on the floor. What we are trying to do is to have such a rule as will work the will of Congress, but still give us a direct vote as between the two ballots.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. How much time do you need in New Mexico in order to amend your constitution?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. You would have to propose an amendment at a regular session of the legislature, which will not be until January 1945. You then cannot vote upon it until November 1946; and there are those of us who hope the war will be over by that time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. In answer to what my colleague from Texas said, and his argument, is like the two schoolboys that the teacher caught turning over the outhouse and the justification of one of them was because the other one did it.

I may say to the gentleman the ballot that was sent out at the time he said so was a Texas legal ballot, it was not a Federal ballot. It was a legal ballot of the State of Texas.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Can that not be done under title II of the so-called Worley bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not under the short ballot, as I stated. The second part of the Worley bill might cover that. I have not studied it closely enough to say. I may also say that Mr. Latham is not the authority down there either of the State of Texas as my colleague said he was. The State through its legislature can waive certain constitutional provisions in this matter in order to make the soldiers eligible to vote but they cannot vote legally that short, bob-tailed ballot, because not only does the constitution but the State laws, and if he is a lawyer he knows it, will prevent them from voting it legally. If he wants the soldiers to be outlaws or wants them to vote illegally, they might be able to cast such a ballot.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The only thing that refreshes me is to see that lawyers among themselves cannot agree. Those of us who have not had the benefit of legal training are always happy to see such arguments go on.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It reminds me of the statement that when two honest men disagree they are both right. That was a statement by Henry Clay, I believe.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Was not the statement when lawyers disagree the honest man has a chance?

Mr. DONDERO. The founders of our Republic have intentionally placed the machinery of elections under the jurisdiction of the States. Does the gentleman think the Congress can pass a law which will in any way supersede the law of the States other than expedite the passage of the ballots?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. My friend from Michigan is too fine a scholar not to have read that section of the Constitution which reserves the right to the Congress of regulating the places and manner for holding the election of President, Vice President, and so forth.

Mr. WORLEY. The constitutional argument which is directed against my bill was debated at length in the Congress 2 years ago. It was thoroughly and completely debated in the House and in the Senate. Today that is the law of the land as nearly as the Congress has within its power to say it is the law of the land.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Did anybody question it in court?

Mr. WORLEY. No.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Did anybody take those thousand ballots of Texas into court?

Mr. WORLEY. No. There were 28,000 ballots cast under the law and presumably any one of the 28,000 could have been taken into court, but none of them were.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. What would have happened if they had been contested in court?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. They would have been found to be constitutional. Is there a man on the floor who would have taken it into court and contested it or do you all know that you passed a thoroughly constitutional law? That was your law 2 years ago.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to point out that the constitutional provision to which the gentleman refers and under which the act 2 years ago was passed does not include the provision in regard to the election of a President.

Mr. WORLEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Let us get it out and read it. It says election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. That is what the Constitution provides.

Mr. WORLEY. Does the gentleman mean Public Law 712?

Mr. CURTIS. I am referring to this "times and places" provision and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, which states that that shall be prescribed by the legislatures of the States, but the Congress may at any time pass a law altering such regulations except as to the place of choosing Senators.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The difficulty may be that the gentleman is in the wrong part of the Constitution.

Mr. CURTIS. All right. I will read another part.

Congress may determine the time of choosing electors—

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Let me see that.

Mr. WORLEY. I will show the gentleman the rest of the Constitution.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. All that I say to my good friend from Nebraska is that he should have borne in mind the illustration when somebody asked, "What is dumber than a dumb Irishman?" And the reply was, "A smart Swede." The gentleman should not ask a dumb Swede, as I admit being, a constitutional question. He is right, and I am wrong about the inclusion of provisions as to the election of President in the Constitution.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think the gentleman is trying hard to reach a good solution, and I am happy he is taking that position.

Mr. CASE. The question was raised as to the problem of delivery of the ballots. Of course, I would suggest that the date be set far enough in advance so that we can have the agreement of the Army and Navy, and if that date were set far enough in advance it should be just as easy to get one piece of mail to the soldier as it was to get his Christmas packages to him. I am relying on testimony which I have read that the job can

be done if the ballots are put into the hands of the Army and Navy at least 45 or perhaps 60 days before. Then if the States have not provided the regular State ballot, I would give him the Federal ballot.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. There was a lot of testimony before the committee which the gentleman from Texas is far more familiar with than I am to the effect that the Army and Navy has not yet been able to deliver a lot of these Christmas packages and to do many other things, that they were hard pressed to find space for these various things. The testimony of the War Department was that it was much more simple to handle this lightweight ballot than some of these tremendous ballots which the gentleman may be familiar with.

He had before the committee a ballot that was nearly 3½ or 4 feet square, one from the State of Rhode Island. You cannot carry those things by air mail.

Mr. CASE. Did that include only candidates, or did it also include referendums and other such matters?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No; it was only for candidates.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the gentleman on his efforts here, but I believe he must remember next year and the next year and the next year, and that his efforts at this time will mean that New Mexico will see the necessity of amending its constitution. I believe the gentleman is for constitutional law. He has his own State against him on this constitutional question, I fear. I commend him for trying to get that constitution amended so that we can all get that New Mexican vote in this case.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not want to amend that provision of the constitution because I never want to disfranchise any of the citizens of my State because of inability to read or write the English language, as long as they are literate in the Spanish language, but I do say that this is a war emergency. Just as in many other things we have war powers and exercise them. We might regard the privilege of voting on the part of soldiers in the armed forces as outside of our constitution and go ahead and take their ballot and leave our good constitutional provision as long as we can.

Mr. CHURCH. Does not the gentleman appreciate that what some of us fear is that Public 712 on a test may be unconstitutional in a vital election?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I realize that that is a possibility, but no person or State has tested it yet.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. What the gentleman is saying is that the section in his constitution was placed there to prevent the disfranchisement of non-English-speaking citizens.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not quite an irony of the vote that in a world war in which the Federal Government has taken citizens from New Mexico and placed them around the world to fight for the Constitution they should be disfranchised by a legalistic interpretation placed in there by opponents of a soldier-voting act?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Oklahoma who just spoke brought something to my mind. I happen to have three nephews from the State of New Mexico, constituents of the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is right. They are fine boys, too.

Mr. JENSEN. One of them is on a bomber, dropping eggs on submarines in the South Atlantic, one of them now is across in the Atlantic theater of war, and the other one is on the west coast. I want those fellows to vote.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. So do I. They will vote a straight Republican ticket, but I want them to vote.

Mr. JENSEN. I want them to vote as much as I want every other soldier to vote.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Right.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope we can arrange some kind of a ballot here to give all these boys a chance to vote.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has again expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have faithfully sat through all the hearings of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. I have not had much to say about the bill reported out or the Worley bill. I have listened to the argument in the cloakroom and the argument here on the floor. It is surprising to me that, although the Vursell bill and one section of the Worley bill are practically identical, yet the argument hinges on the Vursell bill versus the Worley bill, and particularly on the section of the Worley bill with regard to what is known as the bobtailed ballot.

I say that the Worley bill gives you all the Vursell bill gives you, and then gives the man in Italy, China, or wherever he may be an absolute assurance that he

will cast some kind of a ballot. That is the difference. You just give him all that the Vursell bill gives him, and then give him that much more assurance. If there is any opposition to that, it is hard for me to understand.

The opposition is the question of whether or not one section of the Worley bill is constitutional. I really think—and I will never deal in personalities as long as I stay in this House—that when intelligent men, smart men, get up here and argue and do not point out the real facts in those bills, it means that they evidently did not thumb over the hearings, and they evidently have not carefully read the reports of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy; and I have confidence in the leadership of our armed forces.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was addressing the House. I interrupted him and asked him to yield. He was questioned whether or not fair and equal opportunity would be given to all concerned, and whether or not the ballots would be fairly and properly handled abroad. Much has been said about it. I have talked in private with certain gentlemen on this side about whether or not this election would be fairly and properly carried out. It would certainly shatter my faith if I thought any officer on any foreign front would abuse the privilege that you are about to offer the sons and daughters of America. I just do not believe it.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] came into the discussion. He seemed to be very much concerned as to the fairness of the distribution of space in Government periodicals to both sides. He mentioned the Stars and Stripes as carrying a lot of propaganda abroad. The Stars and Stripes does not happen to be controlled by the Federal Government. I believe that men on both sides of this aisle will see to it that, just as, under the Radio Act, if time is granted to you time is granted over there, there will be an equal distribution of space.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] also brought into the discussion the great Abraham Lincoln. He was a great man. The South learned to love him. The South lost its greatest friend in his death. Mr. Lincoln had some difficulty in 1864. The gentleman from South Dakota was discussing the President's message. I do not believe it has been charged that the President ever went so far as to wire any commander of any of our forces, either at home or abroad, about the elections or about voting. But Mr. Lincoln did wire General Grant. He asked him, "Send me what you know of your Army's vote." That was an occasion in 1864 when Mr. Lincoln and Mr. McClellan were candidates, and the South at that time did not have an election.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer, edited by the honorable Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during the period of World War No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

SOLDIER VOTING IN 1864

There was no Presidential election in the Confederacy in 1864 and therefore no lesson to be learned as to voting by soldiers. In the North, Lincoln and McClellan were the rival candidates and the soldier vote was important then as now. However, the Army there was organized entirely on State lines—unlike the organization of the Army today when in every regiment will be found men from a score of States. Then they fought as State men. Now they fight as United States soldiers. It was comparatively easy then for men to vote on the line of States' rights. Now it is practically impossible.

In 1864 it was said by the supporters of Lincoln, "The soldiers won by a big majority."

Lincoln was not above seeking the soldier vote and keeping in touch with Grant about it. In October he telegraphed Grant that while the outlook was good in Ohio and Indiana, "it was none too good in Pennsylvania." He added, "Send me what you know of your army vote." Just suppose next November Roosevelt was to send such a message to Marshall or Eisenhower.

Lincoln's civilian majority in New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut was so slight that it would have been upset if the soldier vote from those States had gone largely anti-Lincoln. In Pennsylvania, Lincoln's civilian majority was only 20,000 out of 573,000 votes cast, and 39,000 additional votes were cast by soldiers, giving him an additional majority of 14,000. In New York, where the soldier votes were not counted separately, Lincoln's majority was less than 7,000 out of 780,000 votes cast.

Samuel Grafton in the Philadelphia Record says that, whereas a few weeks ago the Republican politicians were happy because they thought they had done a smart trick in passing a measure in the Senate that would make it so difficult most soldiers couldn't vote, they now are terrorized because they have been hearing it thunder. The folks back home and the armed forces are demanding a plain and easy way to vote. Mr. Grafton in his article says:

"The Republican Party is finding out that life is real, life is earnest."

With what glee did a majority of the party's Senators help kill the Green-Lucas soldier-voting bill, a bare 6 weeks ago! They never seem to have had a moment of doubt about it. Of course, it was proper to kill the bill; wasn't the big issue States' rights? "The big issue," as Mark Sullivan explained, "is States' rights." Colonel McCormick, of Chicago, thought that the big issue was States' rights. Captain Patterson, of the New York Daily News, also added his opinion that the big issue was States' rights.

The big issue, you see, was States' rights. There was something almost touching in the Republicans' absolute faith that their own special and private language, which they have used so long among themselves in attacking the Federal administration, was also the common language of the country.

This is another case of:

"He digged a pit,
He digged it deep,
He digged it for his brother
To punish his sin
He did fall in
The pit he digged for t'other."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as a climax to this debate and discussion on the soldiers' vote, I regard it a privilege to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Detroit asking that Congress act in a proper manner on this question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the soldiers' vote measure is in an odd position here in this House. The bills come from the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress and there was divided opinion in the committee. Seven votes were cast for the Rankin bill and five votes for the Worley bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], as you know, is chairman of that committee. We find the majority vote was four Republicans and three Democrats for the Rankin bill and the minority vote was five Democrats for the Worley bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], the chairman of the committee, therefore finds himself in a minority position, as a Democrat, on his own committee.

Because of my interest in the right of the soldiers to vote, I appeared before the Rules Committee requesting that a rule be granted to provide an opportunity to the membership of the House to stand up and be counted on both bills, and be counted in such a manner that a roll call would be of record.

Under the rule granted, no matter by what name it is called, no such opportunity is afforded the Members to be recorded and thus the country is denied the knowledge of the positions of the individual Members of this body on this important measure of the soldiers' vote bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite interesting to hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] announce that he was climaxing the debates on this great constitutional question when he took the floor, but after listening to him, I rather think it was a precipitation rather than a climax.

This is one of the greatest constitutional issues that has confronted the American Congress for many a day, and as a Democrat I regret that I cannot agree with the strange message that the President sent here a few days ago upon this subject.

I was astonished to hear the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] bring Abraham Lincoln into this discussion in the way he did, because Abraham Lincoln said that no Member of Congress had a right to vote

for an unconstitutional law. The law they are trying to pass, the Lucas-Worley bill, clearly violates the Constitution of the United States and it violates the constitution of practically every State in the Union.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. Who finally settles this question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of laws? The gentleman knows who settles it and just because the gentleman says it is unconstitutional, that does not make it so.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought the gentleman knew that the Supreme Court of the United States did.

Mr. BONNER. The way the gentleman speaks, I was under the impression that if he says it is unconstitutional, that settles it.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I am surprised that the gentleman from North Carolina does not realize that the Lucas-Worley bill flagrantly violates the Constitution in four places. You do not need a supreme court to tell you that. It has been pointed out to him in the committee and on the floor of this House time and time again. Not only that, but it invades the rights of the States, the very thing the white people of North Carolina have protested against ever since the close of the Civil War. The one thing that the white people of the South have protested against all these decades is the invasion of the rights of the States by the Federal Government under any pretense. That measure would not only violate the Constitution and invade the rights of the State, but it would not afford as many soldiers an opportunity to vote, under the Lucas-Worley bobtailed ballot, as we give them in the ballot sent out by the various States.

I suggest that you gentlemen get the report and read it and see what the Lucas-Worley bill proposes to send these boys. It is an April-fool ballot. When they open it what will they see? Not a name printed on it; not a name of a candidate for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency or the Senate or Representative in Congress. They are not printed on it, and there will be no opportunity to vote for State, county, or other local officers, yet we are told that it is a fraud not to pass it. In my judgment, it would be a fraud if we did pass it.

Let there be no misunderstanding. It would be a violation of the law to vote such a ballot in my State and in many other States. The name of every candidate must be printed on the ballot in Mississippi.

You offer us what we call an Aurelio ballot in this Lucas-Worley bill. They held an election last fall in New York.

The Democrats nominated a man named Aurelio for supreme court judge. The Republicans, thinking that the Democrats knew what they were about, nominated the same man. It was then discovered that he had been hand-picked by one of the worst underworld racketeers New York ever had. So the better element of both parties set out to get his name off the ballot. But they

could not do it. Then they placed other candidates on the ticket and urged the people not to vote for Aurelio. The people of New York who went to the polls to vote were either too indifferent or too ignorant or too lazy to read the names and vote for the individuals on the ticket. Therefore, they voted straight party ballots and he being on both tickets, they elected Aurelio to the Supreme Court of New York, to preside over the destiny of the good people of that State for 14 years at \$25,000 a year. And yet you want to ram down the throats of the rest of the country an Aurelio ballot, and make us accept it in violation of our State laws. I wonder if the President had that election in mind when he spoke of fraud?

What is the gentleman going to say to the people of North Carolina, those people who have fought the battles of democracy since long before the Civil War, if you pass this innocuous Lucas-Worley bill with its April-fool, bobtailed ballot? If they count those ballots, under the law of their State, they are likely to be subject to indictment in the State court, and if convicted sentenced to the penitentiary; and if they do not count them, they would be subject to indictment in the Federal court, to be fined \$5,000 or sent to the penitentiary for 5 years. How many people are you going to get in the average State of the South and Southwest to go out and hold elections with that kind of a situation staring them in the face?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman says he speaks for the people in North Carolina?

Mr. RANKIN. I did not say I speak for the people of North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I regret that I do not have with me the letter which is in my office from the attorney general of North Carolina who has read both ballots, and he says that both ballots will be accepted, either ballot will be accepted.

Mr. RANKIN. I think he is wrong. Besides, I know that other States will not accept them, and therefore, you will be disfranchising every serviceman in my State, every serviceman in Texas, and in many other States. Do you not think that would be a fraud on them?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman knows that in his bill, as well as in the Worley bill, it is left to the State machinery to see whether the ballot shall be counted.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not. Under the law it is their duty to count the vote as cast.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman from Mississippi explain to me how cases such as the Aurelio case, which was a State ballot, would be prevented by the Rankin bill and permitted by the Worley bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Simply because in my State and in many other States a bobtailed ballot whereby you could vote a straight party ticket is illegal. The name of every candidate has to be printed on the ballot. Since this man

Aurelio was nominated on both the Democratic and Republican tickets, they did not take the time to read the names of the men that the decent people of New York were asking them to vote for but just blindly voted the party ticket, and since Aurelio was on both tickets he was elected, as I said, to preside over the destiny of the people of New York at the salary of \$25,000 a year for 14 years.

Mr. MONRONEY. That still is a State ballot, as I understand it, and would have gone out to the soldiers under the Lucas-Worley bill?

Mr. RANKIN. No; that is the kind of ballot you are trying to ram down our throats through the Lucas-Worley bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi, inasmuch as he referred to my native State, to be a legal ballot in Texas it must have printed on it "Legal ballot" and must have been prepared by the State. Unless that legal ballot is voted, the voter who tries to vote anything else violates the law of my State. And I take it this Congress and all good citizens of the United States of America do not want to make outlaws of the citizens of my great State, which, in effect, they would be doing if we had that kind of ballot forced upon us.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right, exactly. Not only that, but you would be disfranchising the men of Texas in the service, and God knows the men of no State in this Union are rendering more glorious accounts of themselves than are the men from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are 600,000 Texans in the service of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House further for 5 additional minutes, so that I may answer the questions of my distinguished colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I know the gentleman is convinced that he is right and I know he is fearless, as is the gentleman from Texas. Would the gentleman from Mississippi have any objection to having a roll-call vote where the issue is the Worley bill on the one hand and the Senate, or committee bill, on the other?

Mr. RANKIN. I have never known Congress to take a roll-call vote on something not before the House. I never heard of such a suggestion before. I believe in the parliamentary rules in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to speak today, but there has been a continuous barrage of attack on the Eastland-Rankin bill which would permit the States to send these ballots and permit the servicemen to vote in a constitutional election.

The opposition raises the time issue. Every State is moving its primaries back for that purpose. Georgia acted first. Mississippi is falling into line and passing her law this week. Iowa and Ohio and other States, Michigan, perhaps, and others, are doing the same thing. They will have ample time to get these ballots to the men in the service and back. By giving them the right-of-way, and giving them free air-mail service, these ballots will go to them—not the bobtailed, April-fool ballot, but a real, honest-to-God ballot, printed by the authorities of the State with the name of every candidate on it, from the President of the United States down to bailiff—and get back in ample time for the election. Then the boys that get that ballot can vote a secret ballot and send it back and it will be counted. A far greater number of them will vote under that system than would vote if this other ballot was thrust upon them. Besides, the State will count every last one of them.

If you want the service men and women to vote, if you want them all to have an opportunity to vote in a legal, constitutional election, so that they can vote for everything from President down to bailiff, so that those votes will be counted and registered and will really count in the election, then next Tuesday, when this matter comes up, vote to sustain the committee and to pass the Senate bill as amended by the House committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Mississippi, I know, has been a great fighter for veterans and for servicemen and I wish to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONRONEY. I did not quite get it clear why the gentleman from Mississippi objects to letting these same soldiers know how each individual Congressman feels on this issue. I did not quite get that clearly.

Mr. RANKIN. The issue is whether or not you are going to let them vote in a legal, constitutional election. Our bill would let them vote in such an election for everything from President to constable.

You do not drag in every bill that somebody proposes, and call the roll on it. You do not call the roll on a bill no committee has ever reported and that is not legally before the House. I have never heard of such a proposition.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The question I asked a little while ago was substantially this, If a Federal ballot goes back to a State which does not comply with the law of that State, can that State count the ballot?

Mr. RANKIN. No, sir; they would violate the State law. If they do not count it, then all the officeholders who refuse to count it, under the Lucas-Worley bill, would be subject to prosecution in the Federal courts. If they do count it, they are subject to prosecution in the State courts; if they do not count

it they are subject to prosecution in the Federal courts. That is the ridiculous situation we would find ourselves in if we passed the Lucas-Worley bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I am not exactly clear as to the mechanics under the Worley bill as to what has been called the bobtailed ballot.

The question I want to ask is this. Up in my district my people do not always vote for the candidates of their own party. Sometimes some Democrats vote for me and some Republicans vote for my opponent.

Under the Worley bill, where you have to vote Republican or Democratic, that would foreclose any Republican voting for my Democratic opponent, and that would foreclose any Democrat in my district from voting for me if that was his will, and it would compel him to vote a straight ticket?

Mr. RANKIN. No; he could write your name in the blank. But you cannot vote that kind of ballot under the laws of many States.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Under the laws of the State of Illinois, unless the names are carefully marked, they are called distinguishing marks and the ballot is thrown out under the decisions of our State.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, this pressure that is being brought to bear from outside sources to try to compel the Congress of the United States to call the roll on something that is not before the House and is not in order, is the most unusual procedure I have ever witnessed. I want to say that the hope of the perpetuation of democracy, as we know it, of representative government, lies in the Congress of the United States. I am not willing for anyone else to dictate to us how we shall carry on these proceedings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House further for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I say that with all deference. I have been here for many years. I have fought, as I said, for constitutional legislation in every session in which I have served. We are telling those boys abroad that they are fighting to maintain and to defend the Constitution of the United States, and that they are fighting to maintain American institutions. They do not understand that they are out to try to fight a world revolution. There is no revolution in this country. They are fighting to maintain the institutions we now have. And the ship of state of the United States, as I have said, is the Constitution itself. I have fought with members of the Republican Party all over the deck of that ship

of state during all these years, but never yet have I attempted to shoot the bottom out of the boat—as I believe would be done if we just wiped out those sections of the Constitution and passed an unconstitutional law that would probably bring chaos and confusion in the election this year.

As I said the other day, when these boys come back we want them to find what? Not the broken, dishonored fragment, as Webster said, of a "once glorious Union." Not the wreck of a once glorious and free Republic. But we want them again to behold that gorgeous ensign of this great Republic now known and honored throughout all the world, bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as "What was it all worth," but guaranteeing to them the sacred privilege of living under its ample folds, guarding the same free institutions, and enjoying the same free government they did before this war was declared. That is what they are fighting for.

If we can wipe out one part of the Constitution we can wipe out another. If we have the right to strike down the Constitution as far as this election is concerned, then you have a right to wipe it out as far as any election at all is concerned. We could then call off the election entirely and perpetuate ourselves in office for the duration. It might save me a campaign and campaign expenses, at the expense of my self-respect, my patriotism, and my integrity. God forbid that I should ever stoop to take such a step. If we did that, then all we would have to do would be to extend the duration indefinitely, declare war on Shan G'ri La and keep it going after the boys had whipped Germany and Japan. Then we could stay in office as long as we lived and probably dictate our successors.

No. I am for maintaining the Constitution as it now stands. I am for a constitutional election, and every State in the Union is bending every effort to make it possible for these young men who are fighting for this country, who are fighting for that flag, who are fighting for this Constitution, who are fighting for American institutions to be afforded an opportunity to vote in a constitutional election to carry them on in a constitutional way, and not be required to cast a ballot that might result in their destruction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has again expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened, as I always do with rapt attention, to my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in regard to the soldier-vote proposals. I did not hear the earlier discussion so that I heard only his remarks to the effect that we ought to be determined in our action here not by any outside pressure but should follow the

rules of the House as to having a roll-call vote.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi on that but I must say there have been many times when I would like the membership on record. If the gentleman had reference to someone outside the membership suggesting that we ought to have a roll-call vote on the Worley bill, I must say to him that I have been wishing for a roll-call vote on it specifically when it comes before us next week, because I do not believe, under the rules of the House and the rule as granted, we will have a chance to stand up and be counted without the unusual parliamentary step of voting down the previous question. I am interested in the Worley bill and want a record on it because it seems the best.

I am just as much interested in preserving the Constitution of the United States as any other Member. I took an oath, and I want to observe it. I, too, feel that the States ought to carry on these elections as provided and as has been our constitutional plan. My State, Arizona, contemplates calling a special session of the legislature to provide changes in the date of the primaries and such other accompanying dates as would be logical, in order to give the soldiers a chance to vote a full ballot and not a so-called bobtail ballot. I hope all States can and will do that. It is an expensive proposition, and any State that will call a special session of the legislature to make such election-law change, to make it possible to give members of our armed forces a complete ballot, is doing its patriotic duty, and I hope they will all do it.

I understand from the War Department and the Navy Department that they find it impossible to conduct 48 different elections for State primaries or even provide for carrying the ballots on 48 different dates. Therefore this thing will have to be systematized some way by the States and Nation or the Army and the Navy cannot do this thing and fight a war at the same time.

I cannot quite agree with my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in regard to this matter. Assuming that the State of Arizona moves up its primary from September to July, and sends our entire ballot to the soldiers from Arizona, yet very likely there will be some other States which will not do that. If there are 46 States which make that provision, and cooperate with the Federal law and the Army and the Navy, leaving two States not cooperating, then, of course, the soldiers from those two States would lose their voting privilege this time. But if we pass some such bill as the Worley bill, soldiers from those two States would have at least the opportunity of voting for President, Vice President, Congressmen, and Senators—which is all Congress can give. Consequently, ballots, under the Worley bill or some similar measure, would be extended to all soldiers. But if the soldiers from my State have voted the Arizona ballot, which I hope they will do, they would not vote the Federal ballot, and if two ballots were received from one soldier, I understand

the Worley bill would make it unlawful to count the Federal ballot.

I think the Worley bill provides for that degree of cooperation which is vitally necessary in order for us to make it possible for all members of the armed forces from all States to vote. I would like to see that done and I hope for a recorded vote on that specific proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, at page 10673 of the RECORD you will find my statement, made in this Chamber on December 14, which is recited in the following words and figures:

I hope that immediately we may pass the bill or a bill that every man and woman in our armed forces everywhere may vote. I do not care whose name is on the bill. I do not care which political party sponsors the bill. I hope that we will not come to the point where we will wonder what will prevail in this State or in that State as to the method. The big thing is that all servicemen and servicewomen may know now, and that their parents and friends may know that each and every member of our armed forces may vote. They should know it and know it now. Let us not be disturbed as to who may influence the vote. The right to vote is a sacred right and the soldier may be depended upon to do straight voting. He shoots straight. As to how he votes is his own business and he must be allowed to vote.

On the last day of the first session I was pleased with the attitude of the floor leaders, both the majority leader and minority leader. I am still. They were sincere. They said, "I will yield to you, and I will yield to you." There was no Alfonse and Gaston method about it. They both wanted the soldiers to vote. The thing that now confronts us is delay. There are rumors and counterrumors as to the reason for that delay. I believe that everyone has acted in good faith, but we were assured that this matter would be taken up immediately following the recess between the two sessions. May we not have action soon? Some say the delay is due to the Senate. Others say it is because of a subterfuge and political maneuvering. I do not know. But the longer we delay the longer there is going to be a reign of dissatisfaction throughout this entire country because the widespread demand that the personnel of our armed forces be accorded the privilege of participating in the forthcoming elections is real and that demand is inherently right. Our servicemen and servicewomen must be provided with that opportunity. It is our job to do that. Let us do it now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me say to the gentleman that I read the masterful speech he made on the floor of the House the last day of the last session. I wish only that every American abroad and at home

might read that speech. It was a masterpiece. It showed the statesmanship and fine ability of the gentleman who has just addressed the House.

Mr. RAMEY. I am very grateful for the gentleman's remarks; I appreciate them.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman know of anyone on either side of the aisle who is trying to deprive any soldier of the right to vote?

Mr. RAMEY. Oh, no; there is nobody that low. I cannot understand why the vote has not been taken yet. I want to know why. We were told we would have it the first day we returned. We new men here returned with the idea it would be voted on that day, for we were told so. See where it put us.

Mr. CURTIS. What we all want to do is that which will make it simplest and at the same time legal.

Mr. RAMEY. To preserve their inherent rights simply and legally.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. At the risk of embarrassing the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa who has just made an observation that if he lived in proximity to Toledo, Ohio, and knew the reputation of the gentleman from Ohio for making splendid speeches, he would not have been surprised at all when he read that masterpiece.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say to the gentleman that I was not surprised, knowing the gentleman as I have since he has been a Member of the House, but I was very pleased.

Mr. RAMEY. I am so happy to have the approval of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who is my neighbor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may extend his own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter from the son of Mr. and Mrs. William Busick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects: One, a resolution adopted by the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America; and the other a letter from a buck private.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. HEBERT, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. McCOWEN (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The hearings on H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, will be continued on Saturday, January 29, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, February 2, 1944, on private bills and unfinished business.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 3, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2652, to amend section 222 (e) of subtitle "Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936," as amended.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943 and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Tuesday, February 1: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works, and he will supplement his statements submitted to the committee in June 1943 with any recommendations he cares to submit following the said hearings and following the passage of the Emergency Flood Control Act authorizing an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works passed July 12, 1943. General Reybold will be followed by Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, and by Col. George H. Goethals, Chief, River and Harbor Flood Control Branch, Office of the Chief of Engineers, who will attend the hearings and will furnish the members of the committee in detail any and all information respecting any and all projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers since June 1943. The district engineers

and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information covering floods since June 1943, which will be submitted to the committee. It is probable that Brig. Gen. M. C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and the division engineer of the lower Mississippi Valley division, and Col. Miles Reber, former division engineer, Missouri River division, Omaha, Nebr., will appear before the committee with respect to projects along the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries and the Missouri River and its tributaries before the hearings are concluded.

2. Wednesday, February 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries; proponents and opponents of projects along the Milk River, Mont.; the Knife River and tributaries, North Dakota; the Boyer River and tributaries, Iowa; Red Lake River and tributaries, Minnesota; proponents and opponents of projects along the Rio Grande and tributaries, Colorado; proponents and opponents of projects along other rivers in the western Rocky Mountain region, including the States of Colorado and Montana.

3. Thursday, February 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and the Director of the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, and proponents and opponents of projects on rivers flowing into the Gulf of Mexico west of the Mississippi River, including the Trinity River in the State of Texas.

4. Friday, February 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects along the upper Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Illinois River and tributaries, the Great Lakes region; and proponents and opponents of projects along Bear Creek, Colo.; Missouri River and tributaries at the Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans.; Nishnabotna River, Iowa and Mo.

5. Tuesday, February 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in the Los Angeles area along the Sacramento River and tributaries and along the San Joaquin River and tributaries.

6. Wednesday, February 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and the Director of the Bureau of Reclamation, and proponents and opponents of projects along the Kern River and tributaries in the Kern River area and along the Kings River area and tributaries in the Kings River area, and including other streams in the San Joaquin Valley.

7. Thursday, February 10: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 9.

8. Friday, February 11: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, including Salt River, Taylorsville, Ky., the Potomac River and tributaries, the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, and the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

9. Tuesday, February 15: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Gen. M. C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer, and proponents and opponents of projects along the lower Mississippi River

and tributaries, including the Red, Arkansas River, Conway County, Ark., and Purgatoire (Picket Wire) River, Colo., the White, St. Francis, and Yazoo Rivers.

10. Wednesday, February 16: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Col. Miles Reber, former division engineer, Missouri River division, Omaha, Nebr., and proponents and opponents of projects along the Missouri River and tributaries.

11. Thursday, February 17: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 16.

12. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

13. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

14. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the speaker's table and referred as follows:

1113. A letter from the president, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1114. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1115. A letter from the War Shipping Administrator, transmitting revised estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, for the appropriation "War Shipping Administration, maritime training fund," including the summary, the Maritime Training Organization, the Recruitment and Manning Organization, and Maritime Labor Relations; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1116. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, in accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, a report on penalty mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1117. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, relating to the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1118. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station, and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1119. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, 1943, to January 1, 1944, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice;" to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1120. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a detailed report of the receipts and expenditures made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, from the working capital fund

established for the operation of the industrial activities at the United States Public Health Service hospitals, Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1121. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting reports of personnel requirements of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 422. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3270, a bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1028). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4088. A bill to create a nonpartisan commission to study the Federal revenue laws with a view to making recommendations for a simplified permanent and consistent tax policy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4087. A bill to dispense with the requirement of a return of income tax by individuals substantially all of whose tax is withheld at the source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4088. A bill providing for veterans' rehabilitation, preventing unemployment, chaos, and confusion at the end of the war and promoting individual, productive enterprise by enabling the returned veterans to engage in such enterprises and employ themselves in place of asking for jobs that do not exist; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEWSOME:

H. R. 4089. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Jefferson County, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. Res. 423. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution No. 1; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Res. 424. Resolution authorizing the printing of the reports of the War and Navy Departments with regard to Japanese atrocities to American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 425. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Chronology of Major International Events, With the Ostensible Reasons Advanced for Their Occurrence," as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass an adequate bill to provide the right to vote to all defenders of our country; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4090. A bill authorizing the President to bestow the decoration of the Purple Heart upon Thomas Anthony Deleo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 4091. A bill granting a pension to Frances Hays Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4583. By Mr. CHURCH: Petition of K. A. Dwyer, of Chicago, and other citizens of Illinois, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4584. Also, petition of Burclay Liquor Co. of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4585. Also, petition of the Seaside City Tavern of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4586. Also, petition of C. Keefe and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4587. Also, petition of E. Ferrari and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4588. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of 40 residents of the Thirty-third Congressional District of New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4589. By Mr. ELLIS: Communication signed by J. D. Poindexter, of Wayne, W. Va., with recommendation of the Wayne County Farm Security Administration Committee on the farm-ownership program in Wayne County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4590. Also, communication signed by S. A. Booth, of Wayne, W. Va., with recommendation of the Wayne County Farm Security Administration Committee in regard to the Tarver amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4591. By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Edward Frederick and 28 other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4592. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, petitioning the enactment of legislation giving servicemen priority in the purchase of surpluses created by the present war and extending them credit to make such purchases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4593. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 1,340 residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4594. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the Parent-Teachers Association of the Bayliss School, Harrisburg, Ill., Ira Stille, president, and Theda Zell Smith, secretary, and presented by Hubert W. Fox, principal, urging the passage of House bill 2849; to the Committee on Education.

4595. Also, communication signed by E. H. Griffith, principal of Joppa Community High

School, at Joppla, Ill., urging the immediate passage of House bill 2849; to the Committee on Education.

4596. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the Town of Irvington, N. J., addressing itself to the President of the United States with the appeal that all appropriate action be taken to insure the withdrawal, in its entirety, of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939, and respectfully urging that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration and Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4597. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Nathan Harrison, president, and E. S. Horkheimer, corresponding secretary of the Jewish Community Council of Wheeling, W. Va., urging that all appropriate action be taken to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine White Paper of 1939, and that Palestine be opened wide to Jewish immigration and the terms of the Balfour declaration and the Palestine mandate be carried out faithfully; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4598. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of the Pooler Lunch, Fairfield, Maine, and citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4599. Also, petition of Henry Audette, of Augusta, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4600. Also, petition of James J. Aman, of Lewiston, Maine, and other citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4601. Also, petition of the Mul's Restaurant, Waterville, Maine, and citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4602. Also, petition of the Roy Blair Restaurant, Waterville, Maine, and sundry citizens, protesting against consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4603. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry residents of Monroe, Wis., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4604. By Mr. WEISS: Petition of William A. Fisher and 660 residents of the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4605. By Mr. WILEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4606. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4607. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the legislative committee, United Federated War Workers Union, Local 105, United Federal Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Deep River, Conn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging enactment of legislation giving the soldiers and sailors the right to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4608. Also, petition of the city clerk, council of the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting enactment of legislation for the soldier vote; to the Committee

on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4609. Also, petition of Frank Nicholas Bellusci, of Hampstead, Md., and sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4610. Also, petition of the deputy city clerk, city of Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the soldier vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4611. Also, petition of Warren F. Hoyle Post, No. 82, American Legion, Department of North Carolina, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to work stoppage in our defense plants and coal mines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4612. Also, petition of the manager, Sherman Chamber of Commerce, Sherman, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to rules and regulations staying in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, January 24, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great God of the universe, grant that during this day we may have the constant inspiration and companionship of Thy presence.

We pray that our lives may be characterized by spiritual frontage and that obedience to Thy will may be the supreme desire of our minds and hearts.

We rejoice in the noble heritage which is still ours because of the men and women who are responding so courageously to the call of God and of country.

Help us also to be eager to do our part in hastening the dawning of that glorious day of prediction when the forces of evil shall be forever banished from the earth and the social order shall be in conformity to the Master's ideals of brotherhood and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., January 31, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. BENNETT C. CLARK, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,

President pro tempore.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, January 28, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hawkes	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Eyrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walgren
Connally	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Murdoch	White
Ellender	Murray	Willis
Ferguson	Nye	Wilson
George	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is absent from the Senate attending the funeral of William Allen White.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.